DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 105 **HE 001 483**

AUTHOR	Kitano, Harry; Miller, Dorothy
TITLE	An Assessment of Educational Opportunity Programs in California Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	California Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Sacramento.; Joint Committee on Higher Education, Sacramento, Calif.
PUB DATE	Feb 70
NOTE	107p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.45
DESCRIPTORS	Economically Disadvantaged, Economic Opportunities, *Educational Opportunities, *Higher Education, *Low Income Groups, *Minority Groups, *Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

This is a four-part study designed to describe programs aiding minority or low income students at various institutions of higher learning in California, both public and private. Findings, major questions, and recommendations are summarized after the preface. Chapter One provides an introduction to the problem and furnishes background information for the study. Chapter Two defines the Economic Opportunity Program, describes the disadvantaged student, and presents information on the Program's implementation at the University of California and at California State Colleges. Chapter Three depicts special programs in community colleges and private institutions. Chapter Four provides an evaluation of the programs and presents possible sociological implications. Appendices provide questionnaires from which research data were derived. (NF)

~~HE 001 483~~

ED038105

HE 001 483

An Assessment of EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS in California Higher Education

Harry Kitano and Dorothy Miller
in association with
Scientific Analysis Corporation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared For
The Joint Legislative Committee on Higher Education
and
The Coordinating Council for Higher Education

Number 70–1 February 1970

FOREWORD

The Joint Committee on Higher Education of the California State Legislature through its Chairman Assemblyman William Campbell, in September 1969 asked the assistance of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education in developing information on existing educational opportunity programs and in evaluating their effectiveness. Specifically, the Committee asked for recommendations on the following:

1. How the educational opportunity programs of each segment of the California public higher educational system should relate in view of the special mission of each segment;
2. The basis, if any, which should govern the direction of students to a particular segment;
3. The potential of jointly conducted educational opportunity programs, specifically a program in which the university, and perhaps the state colleges, administers the counseling and tutoring aspect at the community colleges; and
4. What programs are essential to maximize the efficiency of the educational opportunity program, and also which programs are desirable but are not essential.

The assistance of consultants was sought to develop a background study on EOP programs and to develop recommendations as they believed appropriate. The Joint Committee provided funds necessary for retaining Dr. Harry Kitano of U.C.L.A. and Dr. Dorothy Miller of Scientific Analysis Corporation as consultants for the project. Their report follows. It is a resource document, and is intended to aid the Council and the Joint Committee as they consider the development of educational opportunity programs in the months and years ahead.

Owen Albert Knorr
Director

THE AUTHORS

Harry Kitano, PhD, is professor of social welfare at UCLA's Graduate School of Social Welfare. He participated in the formation of the Ethnic Studies Center at UCLA, has long standing experience in education and community affairs and is the author of two recently published books:

Japanese Americans: The Evolution of a Sub-Culture, Prentice Hall, 1969.

American Racism: Exploration of the Nature of Prejudice (with R. Daniels), Prentice Hall, 1970.

Dorothy Miller, DSW, is Director of Scientific Analysis Corporation, a former faculty member at UC Berkeley and the author of various evaluative studies of the welfare and mental health institutions in this state.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was conducted under enormous time pressures; it was commissioned in October of 1969 and completed in early February, 1970. It could not have been done without the help of many people. We wish to acknowledge a few; it would be impossible to name all of those who have helped us in this mission.

The survey concepts were developed with the consultation of Dorothy Knowles of the Community Colleges, Reginald Major, EOP Director at San Francisco State College, Alan Miller of UC Irvine, and the staff of the California Coordinating Council of Higher Education, particulary Jack Smart, Bob Conly and George McIntyre.

The data from the Nor-Cal project came from Tom MacMillan of Napa College, and gave us valuable background information on community colleges.

William Shepherd,University of California; Kenneth Washington, California State College; and Gerald Cresci, California Community Colleges, helped us to analyze our thinking and address central questions.

We spoke with many administrators, EOP Directors, faculty and students. We learned much, and, because of their open sharing of ideas and information, we are hungry to learn more.

The advisory panel, listed here, gave us valuable criticism and comments which helped us to face up to many problems, not all of which we were able to resolve in so brief a period as these past four months.

We wish to thank Karen Pedersen, of the staff of the Joint Committee for Higher Education for her assistance. Additional valuable assistance came from Miriam Cotler, Marta Steiner and Judy Inmaru, all of UCLA.

Peter Abrahams, Director of Research Development, Scientific Analysis Corporation,contributed much to the development of the study and joins us in thanking all of those not mentioned here but who gave much to our work.

The many EOP students who participated in this study are nameless, but it was their spirit, their story, that kept us focused on the basic issues in this report: access to opportunity with financial and program support to combat institutional racism and social class exclusion.

This brief survey has allowed us only a glimpse of the many problems and potentials which emerge from an assessment of this pioneer program of educational and extended opportunity programs.

Harry H. L. Kitano, PhD

Dorothy L. Miller, DSW

February 5, 1970

ADVISORY PANEL MEMBERS
STUDY OF CALIFORNIA EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. Robert Bess
Student Affairs
Chancellor's Office
California State Colleges
Los Angeles, California

Dr. Eugene Cota-Robles
Assistant Chancellor
University of California
Riverside, California

Dr. Gerald D. Cresci
Dean, Special Programs
California Community Colleges
Sacramento, California

Mr. Richard W. Jonsen
Director of Admissions
University of Santa Clara
Santa Clara, California

Dr. Alvin Marks
Dean of Student Affairs
Chancellor's Office
California State Colleges
Los Angeles, California

Mr. John A. Martin Jr.
Coordinator of Urban Research
Public Service Programs
University of California
Berkeley, California

Mr. Francis Navarrette
Director
E.O.P. Program
Sacramento State College
Sacramento, California

Mr. Adam Nordwall
Chairman, Bay Area
Council of American
Indian Affairs
San Leandro, California

Mr. Joseph Phillips
Executive Secretary
California Council on
Educational Opportunity
Los Angeles, California

(Advisory Panel Continued)

Mr. Castilo De la Rocha
Vice-President
Associated Students
UC Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, California

Dr. William Shepard
Assistant Vice President
University Dean of Educational Relations
University of California
Berkeley, California

Mr. John W. Smith
Director, E.O.P. Program
California State College
Dominguez Hills
Dominguez Hills, California

Dr. Norvel Smith
President
Merritt College
Oakland, California

Mr. Fred Tillman
Compensatory Education
State Department of Education
Sacramento, California

STAFF

Mr. George McIntyre
CCHE Staff

Karen Pedersen, Consultant
Joint Comm, on Higher Education

Mr. Keith Sexton (Chairman)
Associate Director, CCHE Staff

Dr. John M. Smart
CCHE Staff

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ....

PREFACE ....

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, MAJOR QUESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ....

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND 1

Educational "Need" in California 2

Two Studies 9

Programs in Other States 10

Purpose of the Study 11

Nature of the Study 12

CHAPTER II. THE EOP PROGRAM: THE UNIVERSITY AND STATE COLLEGE 14

Definition of EOP and the EOP Student 14

The EOP Package 15

1. Recruitment 15
2. Admissions 16
3. Tutoring and Counseling 17
4. Housing and Transportation 17
5. Financial Assistance 17
6. Other Services 18
7. Summary 18

University of California Educational Opportunity Program 19

Financial Aid to EOP Students 20

Special Admissions Program 24

Recruitment Programs 25

Counseling and Tutoring 26

Housing 28

California State Colleges: The EOP Programs 29

Academic Problems 34

Recruitment Programs 35

Retention Programs -- Tutoring and Counseling 36

CHAPTER III. COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS 39

California Community Colleges: Programs for Minority and/or Low Income Students 39

Report of the Survey 42

Interviews 45

Evaluation of Community Colleges Special Programs 47

The Private Colleges 51

CHAPTER IV. EVALUATION OF EOP 53

EOP in Relation to the Institutional Structure 53

Success -- Failure Factors 55

Financial 55

Geographical Barriers 55

Motivational 56

Academic 57

Other Methods of Evaluation 60

Model I: Acculturation and Upward Mobility 60

Model II: Acculturation with an Emphasis on Ethnic Identity 61

EOP and Its Relation to Social Control 62

EOP as a Means Toward Social Change 63

APPENDICES

"O, to break the path
And point the way unto the stars!"
Lone Wolf
Blackfoot
1970

PREFACE

In the early 1970's, California's institutions of higher education confront a serious dilemma.

On one hand there is widespread recognition of the pressing need for special efforts to recruit and retain minority and low-income students in higher education. On the other hand, there is pressure to charge tuition and to raise admission standards in the face of rising costs and demands for admission to California's four-year colleges. The educational and extended opportunity programs are caught between the two horns of this dilemma, between the policies of inclusion and exclusion.

Institutions of higher learning have traditionally served the top ten percent of the population but today approximately two-thirds of all high school graduates plan to attend college. Thus, higher education today is confronted with choices between elitism and universalism, between tuition and free education, and between traditional and multi-purpose educational systems.

The four-year colleges are flooded with applicants, mostly white, middle class and academically qualified. The community colleges are serving five hundred thousand students in academic and occupational classes, in day and evening school, for both young and old.

Yet in all this array of institutions of higher education, there are few minority students attending California's colleges and universities, in proportion to the number of minority youth in California's population. During the past three years, concerted efforts have been made to recruit and maintain minority students in college, i.e., those who otherwise would never have been able to attend. This pioneer effort has helped to change the face of California colleges and universities, and has kindled hope for thousands of minority and low-income students now in secondary education.

If equal educational opportunities are to be made available to all California's youth, vast sums of money and continued commitment to this purpose is an absolute necessity. The pioneer EOP effort has broken ground, but it is now time to assess the situation, survey the unmet need and to boldly plan for tomorrow. It is for this purpose that this study was developed.

Young men and women from the ghettos, barrios and reservations demand access to their own futures; they cannot be denied.

California is the proving ground for the resolution of major policy questions that arise from the dilemma facing an educational system of elitism versus one of universal access.

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS, MAJOR QUESTIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Research Findings

1. Despite recent attempts to increase enrollment of minority and/or low income students in all three levels of higher education, the Black and Cicano students remain grossly under-represented in California's higher education institutions: they comprise 18.3% of the population of California, but only 11% of the community college enrollment; 3.8% of the university enrollment, and 5.8% of state college enrollment.

2. Of those minority students who are educationally eligible for a four-year college, only about one-fourth actually enroll. Of those who are educationally eligible for the university, less than one-third actually enroll.

3. Most EOP students are carefully screened for intellectual and academic ability. They represent high potential students, often able to meet regular admission standards, and do not consituute "bad academic risks" on campuses.

4. In general, EOP students are as successful as non-EOP students as measured by both grade-point levels and rates of retention in their respective school.

5. EOP students are badly in need of increased, stable, financial aid programs, realistically geared to meet their needs. Because they come from impoverished families they have no resources to fall back upon, and are therefore in constant jeopardy because of inadequate financial support.

6. Recruiting, tutoring and counseling are less important now to EOP than they were initially. EOP pioneered the gateway into higher education; many minority students are now motivated to attend providing adequate financial aid and informed group support can be maintained.

Major Questions

In order to get the opinions and attitudes of EOP staff in each of the three levels of higher education, the mailed survey asked a number of questions of each Director. The responses to these open-ended questions--originally formulated by the Joint Committee for Higher Education--were content-analyzed and were as follows:

1. How should the educational opportunity programs of each segment of the California higher educational system relate in view of the special mission of each segment?

	Junior Colleges	State Colleges	State Universities
Better communication between personnel of each segment	18%	14%	13%
Better articulation between segments	15%	29%	38%
Financial Aid	31%	14%	--
Supportive (Tutor,Counsel)	8%	--	38%
Academic (Transf. academic credit)	15%	--	--
Autonomy for own direction (i.e., work out own plans)	4%	14%	13%
Not appropriate, unanswered	8%	29%	--

2. What, if anything, should govern the direction of students to a particular segment of the California higher education system?

	Junior Colleges	State Colleges	State Universities
Professional guidance	10%	29%	--
Financial (ability to pay)	21%	14%	--
Program availability; desirability	13%	--	--
Some degree of success (i.e., some degree of already demonstrated academic potential)	35%	57%	75%
Articulation	15%	--	13%
No Answer	17%	--	13%

3. What is the potential of jointly conducted educational opportunity programs in which the university and/or perhaps state colleges, administer the counseling and tutorial aspect at the community college?

	Junior Colleges	State Colleges	State Universities
Strongly negative	20%	14%	--
Negative	15%	14%	13%
Neutral	20%	14%	--
Positive	14%	57%	50%
Strongly positive	31%	--	25%
Inappropriate	--	--	12%

4. What programs are essential to maximize the efficiency of the educational opportunity program, and also, which programs and service components are desirable but are not essential?[1]

	Junior Colleges	State Colleges	State Universities
Recruiting	21%	14%	--
Orientation (skills center, summer program)	15%	71%	63%
Support program	71%	57%	88%
Student grants	42%	29%	50%
In-service staff training	8%	14%	--
Program funding	8%	--	--
Articulation w/other educ. segments	8%	--	13%
No Answer	6%	--	--

5. What, in your opinion, would be the implications (both positive and negative) of channeling educationally disadvantaged youth to the community colleges?

	Jr. Colleg.	State Colleg.	State Univer.
Good - can best serve educationally unprepared (but would need more money)	54%	--	25%
Good - can best serve educationally unprepared but not channel all students because of _de facto_ segregation	13%	--	--
Neutral - that's the way things are now	6%	--	--
Bad - would create ghetto school, tracking, racist institutions through channeling in present practice	17%	57%	13%
Bad - are not fulfilling their function of training & graduating student. Thus would doom minority student by sending them on to failure or vocational work & thus not break cycle	--	29%	63%
Unique, inappropriate, or unanswered	10%	14%	--

---

[1] Percentage is number of schools of that type (junior college, state college, university) who noted that type of program as essential. Since schools often listed more than one program the sum is greater than the N. The percentage is thus the incidence of schools, by category, considering a program as essential.

As can be seen, there are wide divergencies of opinions between the various segments as to the future direction of EOP.

6. What is the EOP?

The EOP is concerned with assisting minority and low income students to enter and to achieve success in higher education. The identifiable EOP package includes recruitment, nominations, admissions, financial aid and supportive services.

The specific form taken by individual EOP programs is determined by the location of the academic institution, its major purposes and priorities and the concerns of the director and his staff.

7. Who is eligible for EOP?

The program is designed for low income minority populations. Some programs select students using broad Federal guidelines concerning family income limitations while others make individual assessments of need. Generally, the student make-up of EOP includes high proportions of Blacks and Chicanos and lower proportions of other populations.

8. How successful is it?

The question of success is related to goals. The most common measures such as grade point average and re-enrollment indicate that EOP is a successful program.

However, we would like to add that the evaluation of EOP as a successful venture should not be limited to these criteria. By its very nature, it is an experimental program and one might reasonably expect students to be dropping out or facing difficulty in courses or to be introducing unorthodox attitudes to traditional institutions. Narrowing the measure of "success" to grade point and re-enrollment will necessarily restrict and constrict the program.

EOP has been very important in introducing "color on the campus," both physically and in the curriculum. It has effected a change in expectations in the ethnic communities.

9. Are EOP students involved in campus disruptions?

Realistically, any new program will be faced with a certain amount of initial instability. Aside from the expected organizational confusion, EOP directors were plagued with fluctuating budgetary allocations, job insecurity, students with unrealistic expectations and a host of other difficulties. But, as the programs gain in experience they tend to become much more stable and their students reflect this stability.

Interviews with program directors and college administrators reveal that EOP students are currently not involved in disruptive activities on campus. Most remarked that their students were too busy "getting an education" and that the "middle-class whites" who did not have to contend with as many financial and other pressures were more involved in disruptive actions.

10. Shouldn't all EOP programs be routed to the Community Colleges?

Our strong negative reaction to this question is based on several observations. First, there is the need to maximize freedom of choice for all members of the population. Restricting EOP programs to the junior colleges would effectively exclude minority and low-income students from state colleges and universities just as in the past. All the arguments which have been brought to bear to support the existence of EOP, are relevant to the proposal that these students should have as great a choice as the majority population in regards to where they want to pursue their higher degrees.

Secondly, if this plan were to be adopted, the state will run the risk of turning the urban community college as well as the suburban state campus into de-facto segregated institutions. This possibility was one of the major reasons behind Governor Rockefeller's proposal for open admission to all New York colleges and universities.

Finally, it would be discriminatory to single out only the EOP students for the Community College level--this option should only be used if all students are forced to make this choice.

What about a consortium--that various institutions work together and share resources? For example, can't the University or State College administer the counseling and tutoring at the Community Colleges?

It would be difficult to question the basic premise of cooperation and of conjoint programs among various segments. However, the perception of the viability of such programs is often dependent on position in the administrative hierarchy--the higher and more removed from the actual program the more convinced one is that such cooperation can be effective.

For example, administrators generally respond that such cooperative programs be explored, while EOP personnel respond that such an approach would be unwieldy and unworkable since in their experiences, counseling and tutoring are most effective in the setting of the institution where programs are taking place. Previous attempts at other cooperative relationships have never been too successful, although there is some possibility that curriculum offerings can be used more flexibly among geographically contiguous institutions. Generally, however, we agree with the EOP directors and with the perception of most personnel who actually have to put into operation these cooperative programs--that the problems of coordination, time, bureaucratic hierarchies, ideological and status differences, etc., render the best of good will and intentions into relatively ineffective programs.

One type of integrated approach is the UCLA program. "High risk" students are recruited directly into UCLA under a "high potential" program and provided with supportive services and a special curriculum. The important factor is that these students are brought to the university campus and that successful completion from the high potential program then leads to an EOP slot. When tied into other special programs, such as Upward Bound which brings selected minority group high school students to the campus on weekends and for a summer experience, a variety of programs with built-in coordination, all geared towards giving low income minority students a taste of campus life appears the most effective. Theoretically, a student who might have never thought of attending a university can first be exposed to UCLA while in high school through Upward Bound; go into "high potential" for special training, then be admitted into UCLA under EOP, be phased into a work-study program as he progresses and eventually obtain his degree. Such a model means that he does not have to shift from one campus and one institution to another; there is continuity, progression and appropriate services along each step of the way. We encourage this type of total approach as a more appropriate model than one which might entail a series of transfers.

11. How long must EOP programs continue?

Generally, statistics show that minority and low income youth have not attended college in anywhere near the proportions of the majority population. Therefore a reasonable minimal goal would be that once these groups were represented in college at roughly their same proportion in the general population, then special programs would no longer be necessary.

Another way of answering the question relates to educational generation. The vast majority of EOP'ers are first generation students; that is, they are the first in their family to have attended a college or university. Because of this, they have little knowledge of what to expect and are in high need of financial and supportive services. However, on the basis of the past experience of other first generation college groups, by the second generation, there will no longer be any need for these special programs.

The long range goal is to phase out EOP as a special program as community, family and peer group support replaces its special functions. We concur with the sentiments of several EOP directors who felt that the individualized attention, the warmth and support given to the EOP students could be incorporated into the over-all university for all students.

12. Won't an EOP student take up the space of the "regular student?"

If there is so much space in an institution, then it stands to reason that the entrance of one student can only be at the expense of another. Whether it is an EOP student, a special admissions student (4% exception) or another regular student, the problem is the same--X amount of space and Y amount of applicants. The solution goes beyond the basic question for the answer ultimately lies in the expansion of space so that all qualified students can get in.

The term "qualified" should be amplified. As one administrator related, "Our kids (EOP) are really the most qualified. We look at grades, test scores and recommendations; then there is a personal interview and other attempts to assess motivation and commitment. Then there might be a summer experience of a pre-college nature so that our kids are thoroughly examined "before admittance. The 'white' kids are admitted through gross measures such as G.P.A. or test scores alone. Who is the most qualified?"

The question of qualifications and quality are ultimately related to values, which are translated into policies and criteria. Historically, priorities were given to students with high grade point averages and high standardized achievement scores as indications of "quality" and potential for success. EOP emphasizes the inclusion of other criteria; motivation, life experience, potential to complete academic requirements and in some cases, ability to contribute service to poverty communities upon graduation. These criteria underlie the principle assumption that minority and low income groups have effectively been denied access to high education because of the definitions of quality in the past, and that this has contributed to the strengthening of the cycle of poverty and institutional racism. We believe that the present social realities warrant a re-examination of qualifications and priorities, and perhaps the long range answer will have to address itself to the question, "Should all qualified students have the opportunity to attend public institutions of higher learning."

13. Can EOP solve the problems of the ghetto, discrimination and the like?

Obviously not. It is in reality a very small pilot project. It affects less than 15,000 individuals when the need runs to multiples of this figure.

However, while EOP does not claim to solve the major racial and socio-economic problems facing our nation, it does deal directly with one critical area: the lack of a college education which limits some groups' access to full participation in our society. It is an attempt at finding real solutions, and has proven successful in that context.

14. Will the EOP program result in a lowering of standards and reduction in the quality of university education?

Empirical data has shown that this is not the case. Once admitted, EOP students must meet the same grade and course requirements as the general student population. In fact, many administrators have expressed the view that EOP has made unique contributions to their institutions. The infusion of individuals with varying backgrounds and perspectives has enriched the system and, in many instances, been instrumental in the shaping of new and creative courses and curriculum.

As a New York report comments, "The quality and characteristics of a program will be maintained by the standards for completion of the program, rather than the standards for admission to it."

15. Is EOP a unique program?

There are certain emphases which are somewhat unique to EOP--recruitment of minority groups, special admissions to those who would not have achieved regular status and the supportive programs which maximize the possibilities of successful completion. However, the basic principle is not new--providing financial assistance to those who would not have otherwise been able to attend college. The GI Bill helped a large number of lower and lower-middle class individuals to achieve a higher socio-economic status. At present, federally guaranteed loans, scholarships, work-study grants, etc. are providing this same type of help.

A traditional component of the "American Dream" has been the belief that education is a means of raising an individuals' socio-economic level and increasing the society's creativity. The picture of immigrant groups coming to the United States with little education and using tuition free public education if not for themselves for their children, in this manner is a bright spot in our history.

16. Should there be EOP support at the graduate level?

This question will be of increasing concern as more low income minority students acquire their degrees. Men realize the importance of graduate education. The answer is dependent upon many factors, and is closely related to the initial purposes of EOP at the undergraduate level, but now transformed to graduate education. Questions of finances, of special "admissions" and of supportive services are relevant at both the undergraduate and graduate level.

The primary concern is with finances, and as the number of Federal and State scholarships for graduate education dwindle (as they are at the time of this report), it lessens the chances of low income minority students to go to graduate school. Admission to graduate school is another barrier and the need for supportive services may also arise.

Generally, there should be scholarship assistance for low income minority students at the graduate level. Individual graduate schools should be encouraged to review their admissions policies for greater flexibility in student ethnic composition (many graduate schools are already deeply committed, such as the UC Medical Center in San Francisco and the Graduate School of Social Welfare at UCLA among others). We assume that graduate students have the necessary motivation to use the already available study skills and counseling services of the respective institutions. Therefore, no formal EOP type program appears necessary--financial scholarships and the commitment of graduate schools should be sufficient. Work-study arrangements at the graduate level should be given high priority.

Recommendations

From all of the available evidence there is no question that the EOP program should be continued and expanded. Our recommendations relevant to this proposition are stated in two phases. First, the immediate considerations involved in strengthening the Program will be outlined in terms of categories developed in our research. Second, long-range goals for future planning will be discussed.

I. Identification and Recruitment

Our data show that recruitment is no longer a problem for most programs now in existence. However, we support the notion that this still remains a primary responsibility of EOP. Aside from adding to the pool of admissible applicants, we see recruitment as important in establishing and maintaining community ties. We recommend that the EOP Director work with other organizations such as Talent Search, that he maintain relationships with the high schools and be a visible person in the ethnic community. Recruitment teams composed of the Director, his staff, students and community representatives are suggested. This focus on community involvement is essential if EOP is to meet the challenge of placing higher education within the reality of the ethnic community. In this context, there appears to be little value in using the nomination procedures advocated in SB 1072, as they do not focus on such an integrated approach to recruitment.

One question which may be raised relates to the "type of student" that should be recruited. The programs now in existence show a tendency to limit themselves to the cream of the minority student population, i.e., those who are very academically able (i.e., high grade point) yet cannot afford the cost. For example, one Chicano student with a 3.4 average felt somewhat badly because his enrollment under EOP deprived another perhaps "more deserving" Chicano student of going to the university. "Deserving" in his terms meant someone without prior high academic standing who might have the capabilities to pursue a degree.

Recruitment and admissions committees should analyze carefully the desirability of a more "heterogeneous mix," rather than the perhaps safer method of restricting EOP to an intellectual elite. (The inclusion of community representatives on the recruiting and admissions team will be an aid in this direction.) The degree of "risk" should, of course, be related to the resources of the individual program.

II. Selection and Admission

Our evidence shows that there are, and will continue to be, excess applications for EOP openings. There are two suggested ways of handling this problem; one, through increasing the 4% exceptions quota, and the other by significantly altering the present college and university admissions requirements.

There are several advantages to working with and asking for an increased percentage of exceptions. Possibly the most important is that it guarantees that space in the institution will be reserved for a special category. Under the exceptions allotment, we recommend that an additional 2% be reserved for entering freshmen EOP students. We assume that transfer students from the community colleges will have no difficulty in gaining entrance to the state college and university.

Thus far, our discussion has centered on the vast unmet need for college admission to be found among educationally qualified minority students. There remains at least an equal number of minority students who are not educationally qualified, but who are intellectually competent and who could, with some support and tutoring, enter higher education with a high potential for success. One EOP official[2] has spoken of the EOP admissions criteria in the following manner:

> Admissions Criteria for EOP Students. I must very honestly say that after having worked in this area for almost three years, I really don't know the answers. I have attended a variety of meetings across the nation, where this kind of thing has been discussed and this seems to be the foggiest area of concern. I can say with some degree of assurance that no one has found any objective criteria that is sufficiently predictive, that it will allow us to make generalized decisions. As a matter of fact, I would go a step farther and say that for EOP-type students we can at the very start disregard objective criteria. Let's take for instance the most commonly used objective criteria, that is, grade point average and ask ourselves what this means in terms of college prediction. Do A's and B's in high school really mean that they have conformed to the establishment? Or does it mean that this student's parent was the president of the PTA. Do these things really determine college success? There are, however, a few areas that one might investigate:
>
> 1. Motivation - One of the most elusive characteristics of humans is this thing called motivation. There has yet to be enough study in this area, but it seems to be a quality that all of us can identify, but no one can measure. I would look for motivation in terms of things called "guts" and the "self propelled" student.
>
> 2. Desire - Desire seems to differ from motivation in that desire has lasted for maybe a different length of time then motivation. Desire appears to be something more verbal, while motivation is an internal characteristic, however, one needs to know that the student has and is willing to verbalize this higher education desire.
>
> 3. Family situations - I would investigate the family situation to determine what kind of high school or junior college life this student led in a particular family context. That is, it seems to me quite different that one student has a 2.5 grade point average, while having all the luxuries of middle class life, and another has a 2.5 grade point average and was the eldest of seven children who never turned off the television, etc. So we are talking about looking at a student as not only a academician in its isolated sense, but in its social, economic, and cultural sense.

---

[2] These are the remarks of Kenneth S. Washington, Special Assistant for Educational Opportunity and Human Relations, at a speech delivered at Fresno State College, February 21, 1969.

4. Recommendations - I would ask each student to provide a set of recommendations. In looking at recommendations one wants to be able to read not only what is said, but what is not being said. In addition, the person reviewing recommendations needs to take into account the recommender. That is, there are people who will write glowing recommendations for any and every student regardless of his potential. On the other hand, there are counselors, and college advisors whose image of college is still the college from which they graduated in 1945. Their mental image of a successful college student has remained at 1945, while the world has moved ahead some 24 or 25 years.

5. Autobiography - I would ask each student to provide an autobiography, and in this I would hopefully not look at English grammar, nor penmanship. But I would look for indications of how the student sees himself in society. I would look for some indication of maturity in his writing, that is, I would try to see if he simply parrots what he probably has been told in his youth, or whether he has been able to make some independent judgment of where he stands and where he is and where he wants to go. I would look at the goals that are indicated in his autobiography and determine whether or not the student sees college as a means of obtaining a credential so that he later can get rich, or whether he sees himself as a functioning element in the college life and that, in itself, it has intrinsic value for him. I would look for statements like I want to become, I want to know, I want to help, rather than I want to get from society.

> In the final analysis I must honestly say that if I found a student who fits none of these characteristics, but still indicated a last minute desire to go to school, I'm afraid that I would put forth all of the effort that I could to help him achieve this recently found goal. This probably dilutes all of the above criteria even more. We must recognize that we are in a new area of collegiate concern. Insufficient data prevents our making rigorous conclusions. There may never be objective measures that we can apply for minority-low income people. Maybe that's the way it ought to be.

Both state colleges and the university have made use of the 4% exceptions to admission rules and in doing so have increased the number and proportion of minority and/or low income students on their campuses who would otherwise have been unable to meet admission standards.[3]

But, in evaluating the EOP programs, we learned that these programs involved more students than those who had been special admissions. In fact, about one-half of the university "EOP students" and about one-third of the state college "EOP students" as defined by these institutions were not special admissions, but were rather able to meet regular admissions criteria. Hence, individual program evaluation must assess more than the educationally disadvantaged group. In fact, it appears that most EOP students are, in fact, not very different academically from any other university or state college student, although they may come from very different cultural and socio-economic backgrounds. Often, the special admission procedure may be utilized to admit fully qualified minority students who would otherwise be turned away because of closed enrollment. Thus, any assessment of the college "success" of specially admitted students is extremely difficult.

---

[3] These statements derive from the document, "Use of Exceptions to Admissions Standards for Admission of Disadvantaged Students," CCHE, December 3, 1968.

As we have found, the groundswell of college admissions for minority and low-income students is still representative rather than universal. EOP students are likely to be hand-picked from a large pool of bright, highly-motivated persons--perhaps not representative of the "average" minority adolescent, certainly not of the educationally handicapped or drop-out student so prevalent among minority youth, particularly in the urban areas.

All of these efforts to increase college attendance for minority and/or low income students are occurring at a time when state colleges and universities are overcrowded, when suggestions are being made to restrict new enrollments by raising standards, when plans are well along to charge tuition for all students and when serious budgetary cutbacks and limitations are being set on further expansion of state colleges and universities.

These strains and counter-strains are further complicated by the public concern over campus disturbances, over student demonstrations and demands, and over the uneasy status of race relations and urban problems.

Basically, as scholars have noted, the higher educational institutions are caught up in two opposing concepts, that of developing an intellectual elite, as opposed to providing higher education opportunities universally to all who seek them. As college attendance becomes the norm for all youth in our society, it will also become the demand of minority youth. Thus, the EOP programs, coming as they are at a time of great strain both from within and without, may be "too little, too late," but, at least, they have opened a wedge for some students who would probably never have been able to enter either a state college or a university. This wedge is more important as a symbol than it is in terms of size of effect. That is, everyone is aware that EOP exists, and that EOP students are on campus, participating and opening up new perspectives for the world of all students and staff.

Students who have been admitted as "special exceptions" raise another kind of question. How valid are admission criteria? The way the present EOP programs are structured tends to accept the merit criterion, but sets up a small percentage of "exceptions to the rule." But could not the admission criteria itself be subjected to critical examination? Astin[4] has stated, "the use of the college admissions process to 'pick winners' is not consistent with the educational mission of the institution. What seems to be needed is a serious re-examination of the entire rationale for admissions and increased research to assist each college in identifying those students who are most likely to benefit from its particular educational program."

---

4. Astin, Alexander, The Campus and the Racial Crisis, ACE, 1970 (in press).

From a broader perspective, the use of the special admissions category is unwieldy and theoretically indefensible. Why is the figure set at 2%, or 4%? Why not 10% or 20%? What categories are the most deserving--athletes, the poor, the creative, veterans? If these exceptions do compete successfully, then what is its purpose? Thus, the more important issue raised by EOP relates to the overall admissions standards of the four-year institutions. We suggest that additional criteria such as motivation, background, potential contributions to the university and to the ethnic community become part of the regular admissions criteria. Perhaps a more individualized approach to admissions as is now conducted under EOP could be adopted as a part of the selection process for at least a portion of the regular students.

III. Supportive Services

A. Advising, Counseling and Tutorials

Our research reveals that the peer group advising and counseling program is a very important resource for the student. This peer group structure forms a quasi "fraternity system" for newly arrived EOP'ers; they learn about teachers, courses, examinations and the techniques necessary for survival and success within the institution. Under this structure, the EOP student can identify and learn from those from his own ethnic community who have already mastered some of the unique problems presented by the complex college environment.

We recommend the expansion and strengthening of this service as an integral part of the EOP package. Advanced students should function as paid advisors to newcomers. This recommendation provides for another method of financing students who are beyond the first year and also gives them a share in the responsibility for the success of their own program.

The role of the "professional" counselors and tutors should be re-evaluated. We recommend that these professionals, usually Black or Chicano be hired and integrated into the regular counseling or appropriate departments of the host institution, and available to all students. Their special experiences and talent will be of value, not only to the EOP program, but to the entire college.

B. Community Involvement

We recommend that EOP retain its initial focus of working with and maintaining relationships with the community. By community, we refer to both the ethnic and the "majority" populations, so that EOP staff and students should be encouraged to meet, present and discuss issues with the local college, university and the surrounding communities.

C. Housing and Transportation

The complex problems of housing and transportation defy quick and easy solutions. The large-scale building programs and busing services which have been proposed in the past appear to be financially unrealistic.

Also, the diversity of local geographic and economic considerations prohibit the development of a relevant State "master plan" in this area. Therefore, we recommend that a general housing and transportation allowance be incorporated into the EOP budget, giving each student the freedom to make arrangements which best suit his needs. The concerned director will, of course, assist the individual student in his planning.

It is interesting to note that perhaps in the future, low-income minority students may develop their own "fraternity" type system (i.e., on-campus, group living arrangements) as the popularity of such arrangements diminishes among majority group members.

D. Bridge-In; Bridge-Out

A developing area of concern for EOP will be with those students transferring "in" from a community college, as well as those "going out" into the jobs market after completion of their college education. We recommend that EOP transfers from community colleges be given the highest priority for space in the four-year institutions, as well as offering them those supportive services that are available to EOP freshmen.

The services of a professional counselor who can help the EOP student to explore the various career alternatives, including graduate school education, should also be a part of the EOP package. This area will become increasingly important as more students achieve a college degree.

IV. Financial Aids

The financial portion of the EOP package is the most complex and, from the students' point of view, the most important. Our basic recommendations are to maximize the amount of direct financial assistance to the students and to coordinate the administration of support programs.

Generally, the financial picture is one of hardship and confusion for the students, due to insufficient funding and fluctuations in individual cash allotments per term. Money is coming from a variety of sources including loans, grants and special funds. Students, directors and even financial aids officers are unclear as to the meaning and scope of each category of assistance. One step towards the elimination of this confusion would be to conceive of a basic subsistence stipend per student. From this basic minimum amount (such as $150 per month) individual variations, based on need and other circumstances can be alloted.

The streamlining and coordination of support programs is crucial if the program is to effectively meet the needs of individual students. EOP directors and financial aids officers explained that they had to administer from fourteen to seventeen different types of financial support programs. One financial aid officer asked that the following quote be inserted:

> I'm a financial aids officer at an institution of higher learning; I work at a job which I should not have. My problems should be those of education, yet I am asked to determine who is needy and who is not, who deserves credit and who does not. And then, finally, I must decide what it costs to get an education, to provide life support.
>
> The maintenance of living is a social problem, not an educational problem. Our institutions are designed to provide education and solutions to educational problems. As a matter of fact, forcing the role of welfare on education is one of the root causes of campus disruption. Large sums of money for welfare purposes are being dispensed by people who are educators, not welfare specialists. And many causes of campus disruption can be boiled down to the primary cause: Who should control the money?

The important point is that the financial aids officer must play a role for which he has little training; that of a welfare specialist concerned with budgeting, eligibility and determination of need, and acting with little knowledge of the life patterns of minority groups. However, until a broader and more comprehensive financial plan (see long term recommendations) can be established, it is important to have a special financial aids officer working with EOP. Eventually, we would encourage such a person to think in terms of contacting appropriate faculty, community and foundations for additional supplementary financing for worthwhile programs.

The work-study program should be expanded. Experiences with work-study have generally been positive. The benefits are mutual: the student gains actual work experience in a department or on a research project and the institution incorporates low-income minority students into its life on a more intimate level. The problems center mainly around lack of adequate funding. For example, at UCLA there are no longer any funds available for the Spring semester, 1970. We recommend that the State enter into a work-study plan to supplement the Federal program so that more students can use this resource. Work-study usually enters into the EOP package as direct financial assistance decreases, most often after the first or second year.

We favor the notion of looking at EOP package guidelines as minimums rather than ceilings so that there will be greater flexibility in handling individual cases. For example, the present ceiling on hours and income under work-study penalizes the exceptional student. Limiting the amount of work hours is protective for the majority but in selected cases, students can make good grades and still carry a work-study load and such initiative should be encouraged.

V. The Staff

The various purposes and goals of EOP are a reflection of the diversity of training and backgrounds brought to the program by the Directors and their staffs. There is no common professional background--and perhaps there never will be, nevertheless there should be an attempt to provide them with training opportunities and an impetus towards developing an organization.

Within the college or university, appropriate courses and seminars should be developed for the orientation of EOP personnel. Some assistance should be given to helping staff to understand institutional structures and organizations while other areas of concern include the alienation, isolation and powerlessness felt by EOP personnel. We recommend the development of a "professional organization" of EOP staff with released time and funding to foster such a group. Such an organization could take the initiative in analyzing the critical questions facing EOP.

There are many areas that are in need of exploration: What should the qualifications of an EOP Director be? Should he remain as a separate administrative unit? Should he become part of the Academic Senate with teaching responsibilities? Should EOP be a department, or a center or an institute? Should there be a 4% exceptions rule for faculty appointments with criteria such as life and work experiences to be included? Should there be a career ladder for EOP? What about curriculum--and ethnic studies and salary? How can there be a close integration between EOP and higher education and among EOP personnel? All of these questions and others could be most profitably discussed through an organization of EOP Directors.

LONG RANGE GOALS

At the present time EOP is an effective but extremely limited program. However, the experience with it can point the way towards a much more ambitious effort to break the cycle of poverty and despair which remain as basic ingredients for most low-income minority families. The evolution of EOP should help to point the way towards this broader and more comprehensive program, which will be designed to enable individuals and groups to participate more fully in the riches of the American society.

We recommend a state-wide program, tentatively titled a Social Initiative Bill (SIB) which would serve as the major vehicle for offering educational opportunities to all "disadvantaged" individuals. It would be modeled after the GI Bill--all eligible students would receive a set stipend with additional available allowances, and they would be able to make their own choices regarding the specific educational opportunities they would most like to pursue. Such a program would be well publicized at the high school level so that as students graduate, they would be fully aware of the opportunities under SIB. The program would be administered by a State-wide agency; there would be a pooling of funds into this one agency so that the existing confusion of different financial sources can be minimized. The student, with appropriate advice and counseling will be able to choose among Community Colleges, State Colleges and Universities, public and/or private.

A recruitment team, comprised of admissions personnel of all three branches of higher education (including private and vocational), should visit each high school, and explain the institution's entrance requirements, as well as the special admissions program. Stipend application forms should be distributed routinely to graduating seniors, and each high school should provide a special counseling session with every senior, personally appraising him of SIB and giving him detailed information about the various types of higher education and/or vocational training including appropriate admission forms. Parents of all graduating seniors should be notified of SIB and encouraged to plan with this child for his continuing education, if this is the child's choice.

Universities and state colleges should 1) increase their special admissions to meet as much of the demand as is feasible, increasing special admissions 2% each year, until some further evaluation of admissions can be made; 2) develop student-faculty tutorial programs and self-help housing groups so that each entering student could be helped by an upper classman or graduate student who receives pay as a tutor-counselor. As far as possible, each student should be encouraged to enter into all phases of social and cultural life on the campus, use all facilities, and not be maintained as a member in an exclusive, albeit disadvantaged, group; 3) inaugurate careful, on-going evaluative studies of the present admissions-selection process, of the retention rate, and of the special problems of all college students so that the necessary remedial programs might evolve. There are serious problems present among all college youth and these must undergo continuous study and assessment in order to help the institutions of higher learning move toward new solutions.

Two special areas of concern are 1) the high school programs, some of which are failing to academically prepare significant proportions of their students for higher education. Forty to sixty percent of all graduating seniors can be expected to attend college, and as various types of educational programs evolve (e.g., in specific occupational fields), and as adequate stipends are available, this percentage may increase; 2) the relevance of many current college programs to the youth of today. Both of these problems are beyond the scope of this study, but greatly influence the fate of the minority students in particular. Special admission programs would not be as necessary if the high schools were adequately preparing students for higher education.

In summary, what EOP is doing and why it has been successful is not too surprising. By using the terms "advantaged" and "disadvantaged" we draw the following picture: advantaged students are adequately prepared and trained for college; they come from a background of college "know-how" gained from parents; they have few gnawing financial worries; they know that getting a degree is important in their lives and they have the support of these expectations from their peers and the community. When "disadvantaged" students are given some of these same supports, they begin to perform in the same manner as the "advantaged."

In conclusion, we believe that the question of increased enrollment from the low income minority population should be viewed with enthusiasm and excitement. It is a major breakthrough and one that breaks the following cycle:[5]

---

[5] Daniels, R. and H. Kitano, American Racism: Exploration of the Nature of Prejudice, Prentice-Hall, 1970, pp. 22-23.

> The racial minority has few models of successful graduates... . Even if a member remains in high school he receives an inferior education... . When he applies to a major university, his chances for acceptance are low... . If accepted, his chances for graduation are low... . The racial minority has few models of successful graduates.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

In the past five years, California colleges and universities have instituted both formal and informal programs designed to increase access to higher education for many groups heretofore effectively denied collegiate opportunity. Basic to the programs are two assumptions: 1) that education remains as one of the most effective means for upward mobility and eventual participation in the American society, and 2) that the barriers towards higher education have been especially impenetrable for specific ethnic and socio-economic groups.

Empirical evidence lends validity to these assumptions. For example, in an analysis of poverty, the most common characteristic of those Americans living on incomes of less than $3000 per year in 1966 was lack of education. Furthermore, the color of one's skin was highly correlated with being poor.[1]

In recognition of these factors, the first formal appropriation for a special program came from the University of California Regents in 1964-65, with the enrollment of approximately 100 Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) students. By the fall of 1969, approximately 5300 students (4200 undergraduates) were enrolled in the University of California's EOP system. Other segments of higher education in California have also been active in this area and are presently at different stages of development. The State Colleges began their formal EOP effort in 1966 with 86 students, and by 1969, they had enrolled 3150. Private colleges have had special programs for low-income minorities for an even longer period of time. The formal planning for EOP at the Community College level began in 1969, and by January, 1970, initial funding of their programs was approved.

In some instances, the effects of EOP are clearly visible. Previously all-white campuses now have a sprinkling of ethnic minorities; there are courses and programs in ethnic studies, and minority group individuals have been added to the faculties.

In other instances, the effects of EOP may be less visible, but even more profound. For example, the experiences with EOP and "special admissions" may affect the total selection process. It may also suggest a better method of advising and tutoring. The various types of EOP programs may provide a new focus on the basic aims and issues of education which are often forgotten, until a special effort such as EOP comes along.

---

[1] Louis A. Ferman, Joyce L. Kornbluh and Alan Faber (eds.), Poverty in America. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press. 1968.

We must emphasize that EOP remains as one effort to re-adjust some of the past practices which have contributed to the problems of "minority and disadvantaged" populations. As just one program, it cannot hope to be a "cure-all," and when placed in the perspective of the complex problems of poverty, race and discrimination, the effort and the budgetary allocations are, in reality, extremely minor ones. Nevertheless, it is an attempt to attack one of the root causes of social inequality -- the lack of education. Therefore, the program should be assessed and evaluated so that suggestions for change will be based on valid and reliable information.

Educational "Need" In California

In order to assess the impact of EOP, it is necessary to consider the overall picture. The following statistics are important: California has 9.8% of the population in the United States, and 8% of all the institutions of higher education, but has 15% of all students in higher education. California receives 12% of all Federal EOP funds and 10% of all other Federal educational funds. Thus California students do not receive the full proportion of Federal support they would seem to merit, although the percentage differential is not remarkable.

In the U. S., 41.1% of all citizens have a high school education, while 51.1% of all Californians have a high school education. In the U. S., 7.7% of all people have had 4 years of college, while 9.8% of all Californians have attended at least four years of college.[2]

In the U. S., the median school years completed is 10.6, while in California the median school years completed is 12.1 years. The fact that Californians are better educated than most Americans is a strong factor in the affluent economy of the state. For example, nearly 14% of all employed California persons are classified as professional-technical workers with above median incomes.[3]

California's 1969 population of approximately 19,476,000 is 78.8% white, 11.1% Spanish-surname, 7.2% Black, 2% Oriental and 1.9% other.[4]

---

[2] Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1968 Bureau of the Census, Table 181, p. 126 gave an estimate of 40%, while other studies from California range from 50-60%.

[3] Source: Table F-2, California Statistical Abstract, 1969, p. 94.

[4] See John Egerton, State Universities and Black Americans: An Inquiry Into Desegregation and Equality for Negroes in 100 Public Universities, Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Education Reporting Service, 1969.

High School graduates, however, are not distributed equally among the population. For example, while 7.2% of California's population is Black, 6.3% of its high school graduates are Black, and while 11.1% of the population are Mexican-American, 9.9% of the high school graduates are Chicanos.[5]

Thus, one of the most serious blocks to participation in higher education for minority students occurs in the secondary educational system. Students from these minority groups tend to be systematically underrepresented at each successive level of educational attainment. The unequal educational distribution is further illustrated in Table I.

---

[5] Source: Table I-2, The Undergraduate Student and His Higher Education: Policies of California Colleges and Universities in the Next Decade. "Distribution of Public School Students by Racial and Ethnic Groupings, Selected Classes, 1967-1968." CCHE Number 1034, June 1969.

TABLE I

PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS IN SIX INCOME BRACKETS ACHIEVING UC AND STATE COLLEGE ELIGIBILITY STATUS -- ALL STUDENTS AND MINORITY STUDENTS[1]

A. All Students

	Income						
	Less Than $4,000	$4,000-5,999	$6,000-7,999	$8,000-9,999	$10,000-14,999	$15,000 & Over	All Incomes
Percent of Each Income Bracket Achieving UC Eligibility Status	9.6%	11.4%	11.3%	15.7%	19.9%	30.7%	19.5%
Percent of Each Income Bracket Achieving UC and State College Eligibility Status (Combined)	26.9	26.9	29.4	33.0	37.6	46.1	36.4
B. All Minority Students							
Percent of Each Income Bracket Achieving UC Eligibility Status	5.5%	6.7%	7.8%	13.8%	16.8%	25.2%	12.4%
Percent of Each Income Bracket Achieving UC and State College Eligibility Status (Combined)	20.7	16.0	22.1	26.8	28.1	39.9	25.1

---

[1] Source: UC Office of Analytical Studies -- CCHE Survey of High School Seniors, 1967.

In sheer numbers, the facts are overwhelming. Of the 256,236 Californians who graduated from high school in 1968, an estimated 60% or 154,000 might be expected to apply for college admission. Of this number, approximately 44,560 were minority students. Of these graduating minority students, 11,140 (one-fourth) were educationally eligible to attend either the University of California or the California State Colleges. "Educationally eligible" refers to grade point average, scores on SAT and completion of a college preparatory course in high school. Grade point averages which are required for admission to State Colleges and the University of California are 2.75, and 3.00, respectively.[6] Yet, only a small proportion of those educationally eligible minority students actually entered college. For example, in 1968, 2,977 minority students entered the University of California. One-third of all entering students were transfer students (not freshmen), so that only 1,985 minority freshmen enrolled at UC, whereas 6,704 minority high school graduates were in all likelihood eligible for the University. Therefore, approximately 30% of all UC eligible minority high school students actually enrolled at the University.

Further, while 13,570 minority students were educationally eligible to enter the State Colleges, approximately 3,780[7] minority students entered State Colleges as freshmen--that is, of those minority high school graduates who were educationally eligible, only 27% actually entered State Colleges in California. These estimates differ markedly from white student enrollment in State Colleges. Among white students who are eligible to enter State Colleges, approximately 60% actually enter some college as freshmen, following their high school graduation.

Thus, even among minority high school graduates who are educationally eligible for college admission, only about one-third actually enter college as freshmen, following their high school graduation.

One extremely important difference between white and non-white high school graduates is that of the socio-economic backgrounds. Income is highly correlated to college eligibility, e.g., 26.9% of those from less than $4,000 income as compared with 46.1% of those with $15,000 income are college eligible(see Table I).[8]

---

[6] Source: The Undergraduate Student and His Higher Education: Policies of California Colleges and Universities in the Next Decades, a staff report of the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Sacramento, No.1034, June 1969.

[7] These figures were computed by estimating the percentage of minority freshmen from the total state college enrollments(N = 31,500; 12% minority freshmen = 3,780).

[8] The Coleman study clearly established the strong positive relationship between the average tested academic ability and high socio-economic status (Coleman, et al, Equality of Educational Opportunity, U. S. Office of Education, OE-58001, Washington, D. C., 1966.

Since many minority students are also from the low-income group, their college-potential is doubly lowered. These findings have long been documented and the relationship between socio-economic status and college attendance has not changed appreciably over time, as noted by Dale Tillery.

> While there has been a great increase in college attendance during recent years, the results of this project show that the primary increase in college attendance is among high ability students and that college students of high ability and achievement continue to come primarily from families in the higher social strata.[9]

Correlated with ethnicity and social class status are the attitudes and expectations held by the potential student and his parents. Most studies agree that the student and his family's plans for college are important predictors of his actual college career.[10] Generally, the lower class and the non-white do not include college planning as often as the white-collar majority group families.

Adams offers data related to graduating senior's college planning, as shown in Table II.

---

[9] Tillery, Dale, "Seeking a Balance Between the Right of Privacy and Advancement of Social Research," Journal of Educational Measurement, 1967, 4(1).

[10] See for example, Joseph Froomkin, Aspirations, Enrollments and Resources, Part I, Section 2, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C., 1969.

TABLE II

PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES WHO RECEIVED COUNSELING ADVICE TO ATTEND COLLEGE BY TESTED ABILITY AND BY RACE[2]

Advised to Attend College	White	Non-White
Males		
Among Brightest	83%	68%
Above Average	74%	64%
Females		
Among Brightest	76%	71%
Above Average	61%	63%

TABLE II shows that high school graduates, even when academically equipped for college entrance, were counseled very differently by both race and sex. Brighter white males were advised to attend college more often than were bright non-white males. Parenthetically, bright females of both groups were less likely to be counseled to attend college than were bright white males.

Further college planning among high school seniors is also related to parents' expectations. Among bright high school graduates, 85% of those whose mothers had attended college, as contrasted with 40% of those whose mother had less than a high school education, planned to attend college.

Thus, even for the bright, academically eligible high school graduate, college attendance is related to his socio-economic background, his parents' occupation, his mother's education, his parents' hopes for him, and his high school counseling and advice. For the non-white child, all of these factors are significantly different than for the white child -- even when intellectual ability is held constant!

---

[2] Walter Adams, "Financial and Non-Financial Factors Affecting Post-High School Plans and Evaluations, 1939-1965," Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1969 (mimeo). Our extrapolation from Adam's Table XI, which was based on his tabulation of the Coleman 12th grade data.

Further, research data also shows that higher education in America is related to entrance into higher socio-economic status, but that minority students are less able to enter higher education, and that the reasons for this are multiple and complex. Minority children are less likely to graduate from high school, less likely to be college-eligible, less likely to come from a family who could financially help a college student, less likely to receive advice to attend college, less likely to plan for college and less likely to think of themselves as college-potential than are white students.

The problems involved in changing the present college attendance patterns require a complex program encompassing much of the social life in this country. It is not simply a matter of "open admission" or "financial help." The lack of college preparation among minority children is rooted in the life style of the poor, and is felt throughout the educational and social system.

The Report on Education to the Governor's Commission on the Los Angeles Riots clearly shows how the educational deficit mounts through the school years. By the 11th grade, this study reported the following test scores of students by demographic areas(TABLE III).

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF TEST SCORES FOR THREE DIFFERENT DEMOGRAPHIC AREAS

Test Scores	Econ. Privileged Areas	City School Areas	Poverty Areas
Mean IQ	110.79	100.74	88.1
Reading Level	82	63	31.5
Vocabulary Level	73	55	28
Comp. Speed	79	61	25.75
English Express.	78	56	25.25
Quant. Thinking	78	57	31.25

Children(mostly minority) from the LA poverty areas fall far behind the city averages and significantly behind the children from the economically privileged areas in average test scores. The attitudes of teachers in the poverty areas reflect the despair -- among high school teachers, only 17% of those in the "ghetto" areas were found to be interested and highly motivated toward their students, compared to 73% of their peers in economically advantaged areas.

Finally, high school drop-outs are heaviest among minority students. Even among those children who graduate from high school and who are academically qualified for college, less than one-half actually attend any college.

Two Studies

Two previous reports prepared for the Coordinating Council are important in summarizing the "need" for special programs, and in tracing the development of newer approaches towards this special problem.[11] In the first report by Kenneth Martyn, four barriers are conceptualized which discourage low-income and minority youngsters from attending colleges and universities: 1)financial, 2)motivational, 3)geographic, and 4)academic.

The financial barrier is the most obvious and includes the direct costs of education as well as more subtle factors such as the loss of the absent student's immediate earning power to the low-income family. Forcing a student to work while attending college will limit precious study time which is especially important for those with past educational deficiencies. Financial aid must allow for tuition, fees, book costs, room and board, clothing and transportation. Without such support, many students will be unable to attend an institution of higher learning.

The motivational barriers are more subtle, and relate to the ability of the student to carry on his studies with appropriate confidence. Part of this confidence comes from a positive self-concept, based on previously successful school experiences and a belief in the adequacy of his past academic training. In this sense, poverty and the handicaps of discrimination, race and poor schooling are often too much for students to overcome.

The geographic barriers involve the location and the accessibility of colleges and universities. Generally, minority group areas have poor transportation facilities, and most colleges and universities are at a distance from heavy ethnic concentrations. Further, campus or close-to-campus housing is usually too expensive or unavailable for low-income minority students.

---

[11] Increasing Opportunities in Higher Education(CCHE No.1026, July 1966); California Higher Education and the Disadvantages: A Status Report(CCHE No. 1032, March 1968); Increasing Opportunities for Disadvantaged Students; Final Report(Report to the Joint Committee on Higher Education, March 1969).

The final barrier, if costs, motivation and geography are not discouraging enough, is the academic one. The admissions requirements may discriminate against the minority student; and if he does get in, he may find it difficult to find peers, counselors and professors who can provide the kind of understanding and assistance that will be the most relevant to his particular situation. In general, the skills and the supportive culture at the college level are geared to the needs of students from middle class backgrounds.

Although one can effectively discuss these inequalities as violations of democratic opportunity, Martyn also presents the issue as one of self-interest. He notes that the State, by not doing more about the problem loses a pool of potential workers, especially in such high need areas as teaching, social work and nursing. Ultimately, the State will lose if the "disadvantaged" are not brought into the social structures, as they may seek solutions to their needs outside of the democratic framework.

Programs In Other States

The programs in other States are at stages of development comparable to those in California. Their reasons for establishing EOP-type programs are similar, i.e., that low-income groups have not incorporated college attendance into their usual life styles. Therefore, there should be a major effort to change this pattern through actions, such as analysis of admissions policies, provision for remedial and supportive services and financial aids.

A report outlining the proposed program for the City University of New York(CUNY), begins with a historical view of the admissions policies in that system.[12] The present structure of CUNY, dominated by a group of 4 year colleges of "high academic quality and prestige", developed primarily because of severely limited budgets. As the report states:

> "The demand for places in the college was met by allocating the limited supply entirely on the basis of high school grade averages and test scores. The system, logically dependent upon the assumption that high school students had equal opportunity to achieve high grades and the grades effectively reflected potential for college work, appeared to be inherently fair and was, until recently, accepted even by those who were denied places."[13]

---

[12] The City University of New York: Report and Recommendations to the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York, October 7, 1969.

[13] Ibid., page 2.

In response to increasing demands for admission, especially from groups of graduates not qualified for the University under the high school cutoff criteria, a group of two-year community colleges and educational skill centers was created. What followed was predictable. This "two-track system" lead to one track primarily for majority group members and the second, "inferior" track primarily for non-white minorities.

Proposed solutions to this problem were presented by Governor Rockefeller who promised to ask the state legislature for a "full opportunity" program which would open up an avenue to higher education for all high school graduates in the state of New York.

> "High school academic standing should not constitute a final barrier to higher education. To maintain the academic hurdle is to ignore the deep cultural differences that tend to perpetuate the cycle in which poverty insures poor education and poor education insures poverty."[14]

Open admissions as practiced in the past by many state universities has attracted largely the middle class population. Lower class students who entered would often drop out because of educational and financial difficulties. New York is committing itself to a program which recognizes that disadvantaged students require additional financial assistance and more faculty and university time in order to compete successfully.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study is to present a report on the present state of EOP in California. The specific charges of this study, contained in a request by the Joint Committee on Higher Education, were to develop recommendations on the following:

1) How the Educational Opportunity Programs of each segment of the California public higher educational system should relate in view of the special mission of each segment;

2) The basis, if any, which should govern the direction of students to a particular segment;

3) The potential of jointly conducted Educational Opportunity Programs, specifically a program in which the University, and perhaps the State Colleges, administers the counseling and tutoring aspect at the community colleges; and

4) What programs are essential to maximize the efficiency of the Educational Opportunity Program, and also which programs are desirable, but are not essential.

---

[14] New York Times, December 7, 1969, page 7, "The World".

Nature of Study

This study was designed to describe programs aiding minority or low-income students at various institutions of higher learning in California, both public and private. It is based on three types of data: 1)mailed questionnaires sent to all institutions; 2)on-site visits to selected institutions and 3)structured interviews with students at various institutions(see appendix for schedules used). A review of relevant reports and literature was also carried out.

Returns from the mailed questionnaires are shown in Table IV:

TABLE IV

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING
BY PERCENTAGE OF QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED

	University	State	Community	Independent
Number of Colleges Studied	9	17	90	51
Number of Colleges Returning Form	9	12	54	26
Percent Colleges Studied	100%	73%	60%	51%
Percent of Students Represented	100%	51%	71%	30%

As can be seen, all campuses of the University of California participated, about three-fourths of the State Colleges, and some 60% of the community colleges cooperated by responding to the mailed questionnaire.

On-site visits were conducted by the research staff of Scientific Analysis Corporation and the primary consultant selected representative campuses, where discussions were held with persons responsible for special programs for minority and/or low-income students and with other administrators and faculty. Discussions were also held with Talent Search program staff, as well as other persons and programs focused upon recruitment and retention of minority and/or low-income students in California's higher education system. Inquiries were made into the state scholarship program, Department of Social Welfare Work Incentive Program(WIN)[15], and other financial aids programs for students.

---

[15] The W.I.N. Program, under the State Department of Social Welfare, is a Work Incentive Program for AFDC families.

The research staff site visited 4 of the 9 university programs, 6 of the state college EOP programs, 2 of the private colleges and 24 of the community colleges programs. The on-site visits were selected in order to cover a wide range of special programs and communities, so that the research staff might evaluate several different types of programs in action. In addition, a review was carried out of many publications and reports emerging from the various institutions and programs geared to meet the needs of the minority and/or low-income student. Student interviews were conducted with over 100 EOP and regular students from 2 universities, 3 state colleges, 2 private colleges and 7 community colleges.[16]

This study was not designed to be a complete study of all facets of the problem, but was limited to a three-month descriptive survey of existing programs and problems for minority and/or low-income students in California's schools.[17] The short time was necessitated by the need to present findings and conclusions early in the 1970 legislative session. Much further research in this field is needed, but, insofar as this brief study allows, the following findings represent the present situation in a general descriptive manner.

The research team found the administrators, faculty and students very helpful and cooperative, despite confusion about some sections of the statistics. The "head count" problem arises from the diffuse nature of the programs.

In summary, the problem is clear. Low-income minority students have not been using the opportunities available through higher education for a variety of reasons. The EOP program is one attempt to partially open these doors , so that previously unrepresented groups could become a part of the college community.

The remainder of the report will be presented as follows: Chapter II will describe the overall EOP program and focus on the University and State College EOP; Chapter III will present the programs at the Community Colleges and Private Colleges. A comparison among each of these institutions of higher education will close the chapter; Chapter IV will evaluate EOP in California.

---

[16] Before the results of this study were known, the Governor had proposed that the present EOP program be disbanded, and all EOP functions be centralized and administered by the Coordinating Council on Higher Education, Los Angeles Times, January 30, 1970.

[17] These student interviews were conducted to gather illustrative material and were not intended as a representative sample of student attitudes and experiences. The material is useful as examples and indicators -- not as conclusive findings.

CHAPTER II

THE EOP PROGRAM:
THE UNIVERSITY AND STATE COLLEGE

Definition of EOP and the EOP Student

One basic definition of the EOP student is presented in Title 5 of the Administrative Code, Chapter 5 of the California State Colleges, states:

> "The term disadvantaged student means a student who comes from a low-income family, has the potential to perform satisfactorily on the college level but who has been and appears to be unable to realize that potential without special assistance because of his economic, cultural, or educational background or environment."

Federal legislation views family income of less than $3000 as a working definition of poverty. There is no fixed level at which the California systems of higher education define the term - rather there is an attempt at individual assessment of need. For example, the number of dependents, the number of other income-producing members and the degree of a student's independence from the family are factors to be considered. Generally the EOP income figures do approximate the Federal guidelines, with incomes of below $3500 or $4000 most often mentioned. As a rule the EOP student is from a minority group, although a limited number of whites share in some EOP services.

Aside from the broad and varied definitions of what constitutes the EOP student, there are also individual variations from institution to institution. For example, one systematic definition of the EOP student relates specifically to: 1) special admissions[1] and 2) the EOP "package," so that a student to be counted in the EOP program should fall into these two categories. But in practice, even these two features are not regularly adhered to, so that the supposedly simple task of "head counting" lead to varying EOP enrollment figures. Reports from some programs examined for this study include students receiving financial assistance only; others include those receiving tutoring or counseling assistance; while others responded in terms of budget allocations or other variables which are difficult to categorize.

Because of the variations in defining EOP students, individual sources will provide different estimates of the actual numbers enrolled under EOP. We will present figures given to us by EOP directors, as well as those provided by the University, state college and community college systems, and the legislative analyst.

---

[1] Admitted within the exceptions to admissions standards. In California state colleges and the University of California there are exceptions percentages applied to freshmen admissions (4%) and to lower division transfer applications (another 4%). The transferring student with more than two years of work, even if he does not meet the minimum grade point for transfer, can be admitted without reference to any quota.

The EQP Package

Variations among EOP programs are to be expected; however, there is general agreement that there are certain identifiable elements that make up an EOP package. All program directors stress the importance of each of the following processes as ones which have become integral to the typical EOP program.

1. Recruitment

The first formal step in the EOP program is the recruitment of students. Although there is agreement that recruitment is still an important facet of EOP, the most critical and important recruiting job was at the very beginning. At that time, minority students reacted with disbelief when informed of possible openings in the University, state colleges and in some instances private institutions, since their normal expectations for the future did not include the four-year institutions. Continued enrollment and successful completion will alter this pattern.

There are a variety of resources that could be called upon for recruitment aid. The primary one is the EOP program director and his staff; another helpful group is former students. The California Council for Educational Opportunity[2] is an outside "talent search" agency that can be used effectively; then there are the formal networks (e.g., high schools, counselors) and informal contacts (e.g., friends, relatives).

The major problem in recruitment at the present is the coordination between "becoming interested, filing an application, and being accepted." If the processes are not closely coordinated, many more students will be recruited than can, in reality, be admitted to an institution. This results in disappointment and further disillusionment for those denied entry.

Generally, a college's EOP program staff is in the best position to mount the major recruiting and coordinating effort, since they are aware of the type of student likely to be accepted by their own institution.

At one college surveyed, mention was made that at one time recruitment was left primarily in the hands of an ongoing, primarily militant, campus group. Predictably, this led to a proliferation of certain student "types"; however, continued experience in selection, in admissions, and in helping students get through college has led to a refinement of the procedures. One reflection of the measure of EOP's success is the large surplus of applicants that now face all of the programs. Conservative estimates range from one-half to two-thirds more EOP positions that could be filled given additional funding for the state colleges and universities. Figures for community colleges may be even higher as these newly funded programs are established.

---

[2] The Council for Educational Opportunity, in part sponsored by the Ford Foundation, and funded largely by Federal sources, coordinates the efforts of minority and/or low-income groups in the use of higher education. It is directly responsible for three Talent Search offices - two in Los Angeles and one in Fresno. Two other Talent Search groups are in operation: PACT in the Bay Area, COPE in San Diego.

Recent complications in the recruitment process for state college EOP students are certain provisions of SB 1072 adopted in 1969. This statute affects only the state colleges and requires the designation of agencies by the Board of Trustees, such as the Veteran's Administration, which are to be the official nominating bodies for EOP. The statute takes the recruitment emphasis away from the EOP director and his staff (in effect the college itself) and places it with other bodies which are far removed from the lives of low-income minority students. Furthermore, the recommending agencies are in no way accountable for their recommendations.

2. Admissions

In the case of the University and the state colleges, actual admission to the EOP program involves various personnel, with the chancellor or president having the final responsibility. Typically, there is a review of the applicant's high school records, his references and recommendations, his cultural and economic background, and the applicant's own statement of commitment and motivation. Several colleges are experimenting with achievement tests and many give a personal interview. Grade point averages are not looked upon as rigidly for EOP as in regular admissions, and because of this variation, EOP students are generally within special admissions categories.

Prior to 1968, there was a 2% limit on "special admissions" for first time freshmen, but partially because of the success of EOP, the figure was raised to 4%.[3] Interestingly enough, the impetus of EOP recruitment appears to have been a major factor in encouraging many qualified minority group members to apply to four-year colleges. For example, at U.C. nearly one-half of the EOP students were admitted under the regular admissions procedure. At the state colleges, the EOP student who benefits from state funds is defined specifically as a special admission. (There are, however, some other EOP students not within the official state program who may have been able to meet regular standards.) At community colleges there are no special admissions to these "open-door" institutions. Private institutions in some instances waive their usual policies for some EOP-type students.

Candidates are given individual attention as they go through the admission process. Most EOP directors take primary responsibility for obtaining all of the relevant admissions material, and they also help the student gather the necessary documents. The director then sits as a member of the screening committee that selects the EOP candidate from the total pool. Once selected, the director and his staff are available to shepherd the student through the initially terrifying and often bewildering steps of the enrollment process.

---

[3] The increase in the exceptions quota was made on recommendation of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education and later adopted by the two governing boards in 1968.

3. Tutoring and Counseling

After admission, students are assigned a tutor (or advisor) whose main responsibility is to insure general academic success. Tutorials in specific academic subjects are scheduled regularly so that the student obtains assistance in most core academic subjects. Special remedial help, as well as the general tutorial resources of the host institution, are also available.

Many tutors are recruited from the minority population of the campus and are usually paid an hourly wage ($2.00 to $2.73 per hour for a 15 hour week) under the Federal work-study program. Assistance often goes beyond the academic level -- personal problems, survival at college, and an interpretation of the complex world of higher education are items that can be effectively handled by tutors. It is helpful when the tutor and student share similar background experiences.

The traditional type of college and university counseling has not been used as much by EOP students. Nevertheless, it is important that such a program exists, because as students become more a part of the institution and its "culture," the need for more formal counseling may arise. Regular college counselors may be loaned to the EOP program and may serve as consultants to student advisors.

4. Housing and Transportation

One of the recommendations in the final Martyn report to the Joint Committee on Higher Education was that of subsidizing on-campus housing. It was felt that the old peer group patterns, reinforced by the attitudes of a non-college oriented community, could negate the individual's chances of successfully completing his collegiate career.

Housing on, or close to the campus, although theoretically desirable, remains a problem. It is one of the more expensive items and is often unavailable. The search for suitable housing may place an additional burden on an already overworked director. Nevertheless, EOP directors do help in the search for housing, both on and off campus. The tight housing situation around most major campuses, the high cost, and the difficulty of non-whites to find adequate openings remain unsolved problems.

The associated problem of transportation also remains unresolved. Most directors have become extremely pragmatic about the situation. After trying a variety of ways, none too satisfactory (bussing, car-pools, etc.), they have concluded that the most reasonable alternative is to leave such arrangements up to the individual student.

5. Financial Assistance

Financial counseling is an integral part of the EOP package. Individual assessments of student need are made by a financial aids counselor, who tries to pull together a "package" that will best suit the EOP student.

The entire financial picture is a complicated one. Sources of money vary--from the Federal government, primarily through the National Defense Student Loan and Economic Opportunity Grant, to the State, to the Regents and from student, faculty, and community sources. The amount of student need is a difficult task to assess, and the often unknown nature of the amount of money available until the last minute adds to the complexity.

Some directors arrange for summer or other employment, since financial aid covers only ten months of the year.

6. Other Services

Other services for EOP students include exposure to the recreational and other opportunities available at the institutions. The program also makes EOP students aware of the institution's health services, as many are especially hesitant to use the medical facilities in their new environment. Some programs also provide a period of summer orientation through institutions which focus on the "transition" from high school to college life.

The EOP staff are often called upon to serve as "minority group experts" for their respective institutions. For many of the faculty and members of the surrounding college community, the EOP director has been the first ongoing contact with a minority group member on a peer basis.

7. Summary

The EOP package is addressed directly to overcome logically the hypothesized barriers that face low-income minority students--financial, geographical, motivational and academic. Therefore, it provides aid in recruitment, admissions, tutoring, counseling, and financial assistance, among other activities.

As an overall concept for the EOP package, the idea of a "broker" appears quite appropriate. The EOP director and his program serve as brokers between the college and the EOP student, aiding both sides to achieve greater understanding, better communication, and the maximum utilization of resources.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

In 1964-65 the Regents of the University of California made an appropriation for a special program with 100 EOP students entering U.C. The U.C. program served students who were admitted under regular admission procedures as well as those who were admitted under the "2% special admissions" policy.

Table I shows the total admissions for each group from Fall 1966 to Fall 1969.

TABLE I

EOP ADMISSIONS FROM FALL 1966 THROUGH FALL 1969 BY SPECIAL AND REGULAR ADMISSIONS FOR FRESHMEN AND TRANSFER STUDENTS

	Fall	1966	Fall	1967	Fall	1968	Fall	1969 (est.)
	SP.	REG	SP.	REG	SP.	REG	SP.	REG
Freshmen	75	166	143	306	306	287	743	823
Transfers	65	48	139	106	199	105		
TOTALS	140(1)	214	282(1)	412	505(1)	392	743(2)	823

(1) University of California EOP Reports
(2) Responses to SAC questionnaire (UCLA totals estimated)

As can be seen, the number of EOP students has increased[4] steadily over the years, with 1566 new EOP admissions in the Fall of 1969.[4] Of these,

---

[4] Yet, as others have noted, the number of Blacks has not markedly increased, and remains at 2% of the total U.C. enrollment. In fact, there are nearly twice as many undergraduate foreign students at the University as there are Black students (2443 foreign students compared to 1456 Blacks). These same findings prevail at 80 public universities as reported by John Egerton in "State Universities and Black Americans", NASULGC, 1969. Egerton comments that "the University of California's exacting academic standards have had the effect of excluding all but a relative handful of Negroes and Mexican-Americans - and all but a very low percentage of the poor, whatever their race. The University has never been segregated by law ... but for economic and academic reasons it has been segregated in fact." p. 1155.

46% are special admissions, i.e., those students whose grade point average was less than 3.0 and whose test scores were below that required for regular UC admission. About two-thirds of all UC-EOP admissions are freshmen, while one-third are transfers from other schools.

Who is a University EOP student? What qualifies a student for consideration in the UC-EOP program?

These questions were asked of every UC-EOP director on the survey questionnaire. The responses varied, but in general, an EOP student was defined as one who is considered in need of special financial and/or academic aid in order to attend UC. Not all students who receive financial aid are EOP students; some studies have shown that scholarship aid occurs as frequently for students from higher income groups as for students from lower income groups.[5] Neither are all EOP students those who require special admissions; about one-half of the EOP students at UC have qualified for regular UC admission. The UC-EOP goals were to find and finance "culturally deprived" students at UC, and then to sponsor a wide variety of recruitment and retention programs for this group. Every EOP student was to be given a "package," tailored to meet his financial, housing, counseling and tutoring needs. In 1968, 3.7 million dollars was available for financial aid to 2038 EOP students.[6] The distribution by ethnic group enrollment for the total University and for EOP as of the Fall of 1968 is shown in Table II.

Financial Aid to EOP Students

According to the figures given by the University, each EOP student receives financial aid, on the average, in the amount of $1504, while the administrative cost per student is $311. That is, 17¢ out of every EOP dollar is spent for administration and program, while 83¢ is given to the student as direct financial aid.[7]

One of the questions asked of UC-EOP students in the research interviews was about their financial aid "package." The following are some excerpts from student interviews regarding their financial problems:

> A Black male, age 18, entered UC from high school to obtain an education "relevant to Black people." He lives with his mother and five siblings who are on AFDC. He finds that the amount of financial aid he receives ($1210) is inadequate for his needs. His mother is applying pressure for him to drop out of college and get a job in order to help out financially at home. He felt that an "ideal EOP" would offer a much larger financial aid program where "you could get money easier

---

[5] Martyn, Kenneth, Increasing Opportunities for Disadvantaged Students, Dec., 1967.

[6] As reported by John Egerton, State Universities and Black Americans, Southern Education Reporting Service, 1969.

[7] Source: Personal correspondence, Kitano - William Shepard, Assistant Vice President, Jan. 12, 1970.

TABLE II

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION - UNDERGRADUATE ETHNIC GROUP AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM DISTRIBUTION - FALL 1968

	Total University	EOP
Black	1,456	960
Mexican	1,186	550
American Indian	167	27
Oriental	3,794	262
White[1]	57,491	163
Other	320	76
Foreign	2,443	--
Totals	66,857	2,038

---

[1]	
Total undergraduate enrollment reported ...	66,857
Foreign undergraduate enrollment	2,443
	64,414
Ethnic minority total reported	6,923
Derived number of white students	57,491

Sources of above information

1. All campus University ethnic totals from February 14, 1969, Report of Vice President--Planning and Analysis, from Fall 1968 Voluntary Ethnic Census.

2. EOP ethnic distribution from campus reports submitted by EOP offices for Fall 1968.

   Information on ethnic background of EOP and all University students for Fall 1969 is not yet available. An estimate is available from questionnaires of Scientific Analysis Corp. to EOP Directors.

TABLE III

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM ENROLLMENT AND BUDGET ALLOCATIONS - 1969-70[8]

Campus	EOP Enrollment 1969-70	Program Expense Including Administration, Counselling & Tutoring	Cost/Student	Student Aid Funds*	Aid/Student
Berkeley	1,290	$ 338,662	$263	$1,850,096	$1,434
Davis	385	141,506	368	816,600	2,121
Irvine	115	42,408	369	185,637	1,614
Los Angeles	1,500	518,337	346	1,915,795	1,277
Riverside	167	71,315	427	323,280	1,936
San Diego	212	57,342	271	246,047	1,160
Santa Barbara	457	97,359	213	888,391	1,944
Santa Cruz	120	51,700	430	162,816	1,358
All Campuses	4,246	$1,318,629	$311	$6,388,662	$1,504

*Controlled by University of California

---

[8] Ibid.

and quicker, and should be made available to all Blacks having a desire to attend college."

A 19 year old Chinese male student from a family of four children resides with his parents, who have an income of about $5000 per year. He saw an EOP brochure which offered financial aid, counseling and tutoring. He had a GPA of 3.7, so he did not require special admission, but needed financial assistance. He receives about $1200 per year in scholarships, grants, loans and work study jobs (15 hours a week as a tutor for other EOP students in math and physics). His parents supplement his expenses with about $300 per year. He feels this puts a considerable burden upon them, as they are also sending his sister through school.

A Black husband, age 25 (a transfer junior), resides with his wife and infant son in a $130 a month apartment. He works as many hours as possible as a shoe clerk, and because there is so much added expense with the baby, he had to take out a loan along with his $800 EOP financial aid "package." He is under great pressure because of his financial problems, and he doesn't have time to study and receive tutoring, which he feels he needs. He felt that the "EOP people didn't spend enough time" to consider each case on its individual merits. He feels if he does not receive some type of secure financial aid he will be forced to leave the University.

A 20 year old Chicano boy, from a family of 8, is the first one in his family ever to complete high school and to enter college. He spent one year at a State College where he had been recruited in order "to add a little color to the campus." He transferred into UC, and was given housing and an "EOP Budget." He is confused by this EOP budget, which he feels is very unrealistic. For example, his budget allows $150 for books, and he has already spent $75.00 in the first quarter. While he is budgeted $10 a month for recreation and amusement, he feels that there is actually seldom enough money for the bare essentials.

A 28 year old Indian male at UCLA was feeling the financial pinch. His search for cheaper housing was one solution to his financial problems.

All UC students interviewed felt under considerable financial pressure, and indicated the need for increased financial assistance based on a realistic assessment of the actual expenses. Since many of these students came from impoverished families, they were without any form of outside resources. One student from Berkeley complained about the lack of work-study jobs near the Berkeley campus, which precluded her accepting outside employment due to the distance she would need to travel. All UC-EOP students interviewed expressed the need for increased financial assistance as their highest priority need in the present EOP program.

Special Admissions Program

The second major category for defining an EOP student at UC is a student who does not have the necessary academic qualifications (grade point below 3.0, or low SAT scores or did not take a college-prep course in high school) for regular UC admission. As previously noted, less than one-half of all UC-EOP students are "special admissions." The criteria for special admission for individual students vary from campus to campus, but in general, the EOP director is responsible for selecting those who, in his judgement, have academic potential for University level work, but who, for educational reasons do not qualify. One UC-EOP director reported that all EOP applicants must take the College Board exams and must supply letters of recommendation from two of their former high school teachers. He then selects applicants from an examination of their test scores, recommendations and interviews. He felt that since UC is a white, middle-class elite institution, he should recruit students who have a real chance of "making it." He selects those who he honestly believes can carry a real university load and succeed. Then, even if EOP closes down, these EOP students will be in the academic "mainstream" and will be able to go on.

Another EOP director reported he selected EOP applicants by utilizing two student committees, one Black and one Chicano, to assist him in the process. He attempted to bring in students who would otherwise never have been able to get into the University. He felt that this was the real value of an EOP program, since academically qualified minority or low-income students could be admitted outside of the EOP. When the "high-risk" applicants were selected, he then negotiated their admissions with the school's Admission Office. He also utilized referrals from the local Talent Search program. In addition, he visited high schools in the minority areas, where he searched for students with potential rather than proven ability. He elaborated, during the interview, about the Talent Search referrals, stating that only one in six of those referrals were gaining entrance and that there is a great unmet need for university admissions among high-potential minority and poor students. He sent out about 500 applications, received 180 completed, and was only able to accept 90 in either the Regular or Special Admissions program.

One question on the survey form asked each EOP director about the number of applications received, and the percentage considered, the percentage admitted under regular and special admissions. The UC-EOP directors reported that approximately 3000 applications for EOP admissions were received at the Fall term, 1969. Of these, 64% were evaluated and considered for admission by the EOP directors; of all who applied, 31% were admitted under Regular Admissions procedures, and 26% were admitted under the Special Admissions procedures. Thus, about one-third of actual EOP applicants are being turned away from UC admission at the present time. As a result, EOP directors in UC have a large pool of EOP applicants to select for suitable UC admissions. The possible pool of minority students who would be good risks for special admission programs are at least as great as the academically qualified pool of high school graduates, and from this group 743 students were admitted as special admission students.

The vast need among minority high school graduates for university admissions remains virtually unmet, both among those academically qualified and those with high potential who, because of their high school experiences, would not qualify for regular UC admission. In order to admit even one-half of the educationally qualified minority students, UC would need to greatly enlarge its present EOP programs (as much as five times more to cover those motivated and qualified!).

Recruitment Programs

Given the facts stated above, the UC-EOP recruitment programs appear to be the least needed of all special services now covered by EOP programs. In fact, the major problem facing many EOP directors is the mounting pressure for admission from minority students, many of whom are educationally qualified. However, EOP recruitment programs need to be evaluated with a historical perspective. The University pioneer recruitment programs for minority students have opened up the University to hundreds of minority students, both in EOP and regular University admissions, and have blazed a trail that hundreds more will take as the dream becomes real.

In October, 1967, the University conducted a study of the social and racial characteristics of potential students. As an example, the 1967 data for Blacks is compared with 1969 data for Blacks in the table below:

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF BLACK POPULATION HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS AND UC STUDENTS (1967 AND 1969)

Blacks	1967	1969
Calif. Population	6.0%	7.0%
Calif. High School Seniors	3.6%	4.0%
University Students	1.0%	2.0%

The percentage of Blacks attending UC doubled over the three EOP years, and the same general trend holds for the Chicano population as well. However, the increase in minority enrollment, while striking in some respects, remains far behind the total minority potential enrollment.

As more students from minority groups attend the University, more minority students begin to view the University as a desirable pathway to upward mobility. It is likely that the pressure for additional enrollment of minority students will increase geometrically.

As the University develops ethnic studies programs, and as minority students become more conscious of their own ethnic identities, additional pressure will mount for participation in these studies. As the present UC students graduate and move into their own communities, the pressure will again increase as the minority communities adopt new role models.

Thus, recruitment per se will not be a major program need for UC-EOP in the future; rather, the selection process will increasingly come under heavy pressure as more and more qualified and motivated minority students apply for admission, both for EOP and for Regular Admission. As minority students increase their membership in student organizations, like the Black Students Union and United Mexican-American Students, all campuses can expect to face heavy demands for minority admissions proportionately closer to the population distribution of minority groups in the state.

Discussion with UC-EOP directors revealed that most continue recruitment visits to selected high schools where they have formed good working relationships with principals and counselors. UC Berkeley has a shared recruitment/teaching program with Merritt College, which has developed a good transfer program for the urban community college. Other University programs extend into community high schools and summer tutorial programs.

However, cooperation with the Ford Foundation sponsored Talent Search programs appears less than satisfactory, at least from the perspective of those community-recruiters who attempt to refer minority students into UC-EOP programs. They feel that their selections are often turned away in favor of personal selections made by UC-EOP staff. On several UC campuses, the EOP student admissions each year are small enough (around 100) to allow personal attention to be given to each applicant by the EOP staff.

In UC student research interviews, students were asked about their own recruitment experiences. One-fourth of the UC students interviewed were not formally recruited to the UC-EOP program, but came to UC upon the advice of their friends; one-half were recruited by their high school counselor; and one-fourth had some type of contact with the UC-EOP staff. Thus, recruitment, per se, does not seem to be a central EOP problem, even for students who entered one or two years ago.

Counseling and Tutoring

Nearly all UC-EOP directors and program staff felt that counseling is a crucial and important EOP program, without which the program could not succeed. It is difficult to know what is actually involved in "counseling." Some indications appear to relate counseling to some form of relationship therapy for minority students who may suffer from "culture-shock" upon entering into University life. Just how many students are counseled, and what the results are could not be determined by this study.

The tutoring programs are somewhat more definitive. The UC-EOP responses indicated that these services were being given to 1973 EOP students at an average yearly expense of $125.00 per student. The EOP directors feel that the tutoring and/or counseling services account for much of the EOP success in UC. In figures contained in the UC budget allocations, the cost for program administration and tutoring-counseling services averages $311 per student, which again restates the EOP directors' contention that these services are meaningful and necessary for EOP students.[9] Much of the tutoring work is done by EOP students on the Federal Work Study program.

Each student interviewed was asked about tutoring and/or counseling services. One-half of the students reported receiving tutoring and/or counseling services, and of these, 80% were well satisfied and felt that it had been helpful for them. Two students were themselves engaging in tutoring or counseling other EOP students as a work-study job and felt that they were able to be effective in working with other EOP students because of their own experience. One student, a 39 year old Chicano divorcee mother of three teen-aged children, is attending UC in order to become a professional counselor, since she feels strongly about its value. She recounted that when she was in high school she had been advised to go to beauty school instead of attending college, although she had been a straight "A" student. It was this type of counseling that convinced her that the only way to combat institutionalized racism was to go into counseling herself, and this has motivated her to return to college under the EOP program.

The other one-half of the students interviewed had not utilized tutoring or counseling services, although a few indicated they needed tutoring but were too busy working to be able to arrange for it. Many complained that initially they had not been given sufficient information about the EOP program or about University life in general. One young Chicano student had been told of his acceptance in the UC-EOP program only three days prior to registration. He felt he should have been notified at least 60 days ahead of time in order to prepare in a more reasonable manner. In short, tutoring programs seem to be helpful to those EOP students who utilize them, although it appears that not all EOP students do so, even when it seems apparent they are in need of such help.

In summary, it would appear that like many social services, the assessment of its value varies significantly between the giver and the receiver of that service.

---

[9] The discrepancy between EOP enrollment figures furnished in the 1969-70 UC-EOP Enrollment and Budget Allocations (4246), and those indicated by the University statewide administrator's tables for EOP enrollment for Fall 1968 (2038), plus the 1566 admissions estimated for the Fall 1969 EOP (totaling 3604, if no dropouts occurred), make accurate estimates of the real EOP enrollment virtually impossible to obtain. There are many confusions as to the total EOP enrollment, the total EOP admissions, etc., throughout all program reports. For example, our study found a total UC-EOP enrollment of 3604; UC reports it to be 4200.

v

Housing

About one-half of the EOP students entering UC reside in the student dorms. The rest live with their family or friends. Housing for minority students in all-white communities constitutes an ever-present problem. An interesting "fraternity house" situation for minority students may be evolving around housing and group tutoring services. Informal groups of minority students appear to be forming and offering emotional and intellectual support to each other, much as was the case among fraternities and society members two decades ago. This peer-group situation appears to hold much promise for future expansion of minority participation in university life. All EOP students feel housing to be a serious problem, but these seem generally to be related to the overall financial situation of the students.

In short, EOP students have all the problems experienced by poor persons who must live and work side by side with persons from an affluent group. Relatively, most UC students are very affluent compared to EOP students, and this social-cultural differential creates many problems not directly related to academic ability or motivation. As reported by UC[10], one-half of UC's undergraduate student body is composed of students from families earning over $10,000 per year and with college-educated fathers. In many situations, this contrast is a difficult psychological barrier for poor, minority students who must compete academically and socially with students from a higher socio-economic background. No amount of tutoring or counseling can really bridge such a gap. A counselor is not an adequate substitute for a wealthy father, but that seems to be the best possible alternative available for EOP students. Perhaps the cry of "irrelevance" so frequently heard on college campuses springs from these social chasms present on campus as contrasted with life in the ghettos and barrios.

---

[10] See "Socio-Economic Characteristics of UC Students and Potential Students" Op. Cit., 1967.

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES: THE EOP PROGRAMS

Many of the same factors which described UC-EOP programs also apply to the State Colleges EOP programs. The programs vary, although the basic EOP Package remains constant.

The first EOP program at the State Colleges enrolled 86 students during 1966-67, then grew to 316 in 1967-68, 1707 in 1968-69 and approximately 4200 in 1969-70, according to CSC offical reports.[11]

For the survey conducted at the State Colleges, the return rate was very disappointing. Only 12 of the 17 State College EOP directors, serving 51% of the State College students returned the form. The non-response seems directly related to the present tenuous status of the EOP program in the State Colleges and to the low morale and wide-spread feelings of distrust of the legislature and administration that pervades many levels of state college life.

The definition of an EOP student in the State Colleges varies widely. Some EOP directors define an EOP student as one who requires special admission; others include those who meet regular admission standards but who require special support services in the EOP; others include any student who participates in EOP programs or services.

Thus, each EOP director defines his program differently, depending upon his definition of the EOP student. Some State College programs consider an EOP student to be a minority student who, because of his disadvantaged social background, is unable to gain regular admittance to college, is admitted as a "special admissions student" and given tutoring and financial support to help him remain in college. Others include in their programs regularly admitted students who require EOP tutoring and/or counseling services as well as financial aid. These definitions provide overlap so that actual counting of EOP students per se is somewhat confused. In the Fall term of 1969, 2906 new EOP students enrolled, with 1310 former EOP students re-enrolling, a total of 4216 EOP students in State Colleges, an overall increase of 78% for the year.[12] State College staffs have estimated in excess of 5000 total EOP students. The State program is designed to serve some 3150 students at the present time. Of these, 59% are Black, 34% are Chicano, 2% are Oriental, and 4% are white (as given in California State Colleges report, April 1969).

---

[11] Educational Opportunity Programs at the California State Colleges, November, 1969. Office of the Chancellor, p. 2.

[12] These figures from EOP in CSC, Implementation of Senate Bill 1072, do not always match other reported EOP statistics. For example, the Legislative Analyst, State of Calif., Educational Opportunity Programs in Calif.'s Institutions of Higher Education (mimeo), Dec. 4, 1969, gives the EOP enrollment as 3150 at a total cost of $2,350,000; still another report received from CCHE tallies the EOP State College total at 4736, based on State College documents. Another State College report, Educational Opportunity Program, April 1969, K. Washington gave 2342 as total EOP enrollment, of which 1825 were exception admissions enrolled in EOP. The total program costs in that

TABLE V

COMPARISON OF 1968 AND 1969 ENROLLMENT AND RE-ENROLLMENT
CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES[13]

	1968 Enrolled	Fall 1969 Re-enrolled	Fall 1969 New Enrollees	1969-70 Total 1969
CSC Dominguez Hills	54	41	79	120
Fullerton	55	46	160	206
Hayward	--	--	103	103
Long Beach	313	244	240	484
Los Angeles	151	133	460	593
San Bernadino	22	16	35	51
Cal Poly, Pomona	13	8	71	79
San Luis Obispo	22	15	21	36
Chico	72	60	76	136
Fresno	75	57	179	236
Sacramento	73	70	145	215
San Diego	56	45	193	238
San Fernando	225	225	385	610
San Francisco	428	300	275	575
San Jose	--	--	410	410
Sonoma St.	64	42	39	81
Stanislaus	10	8	35	43
Total	1633	1310	2906	4216

---

[12] (cont.) report were $2,475,000. Thus, statistics on total EOP enrollment and the programs costs vary considerably. In our report, we received enrollment statistics from 9 state colleges, reporting 2219 EOP students out of 63,081 total student body enrollment (about 3½% of total student enrollment).

[13] Source: California State Colleges EOP, Office of Chancellor, Nov. 1969. See also p. 2 of Robert Bess, California State College Statement of December 3, 1969. He has 3213 EOP enrollees plus 2200 returnees, or 5413!

The EOP students are only part of the total minority population of the State Colleges. The total 1969 enrollment by ethnicity was not available, but based on the Federal HEW report in 1968, 10% of all State College students are from minority populations, as shown below.

TABLE VI

ETHNIC BACKGROUND, CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE (HEW CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLIANCE REPORT) 1968

Fall 1968			Estimated EOP (1969)	
Black	5151	3%	2487	59%
Spanish surname	5210	3%	1433	34%
American Indian[14]	1229	.7%	44	1%
Oriental	6092	3%	84	2%
Caucasian	161721	90%	168	4%
Total	179403	100%	4216	100%

EOP students constitute less than 3% of all state college enrollment, and 24% of the total minority enrollment.

The cost of the present EOP program in State Colleges is estimated (from our partial returns) to be $746 per student with approximately $610 going to the student directly as financial aid. Therefore, out of every EOP dollar, 20¢ goes for administration and program and 80¢ goes to the student as direct aid.

Student aid is drawn from a number of sources. EOP students are given a financial aid package, consisting of an EOP grant, Federal loans, as well as work-study plans. Most of these are administered by the regular scholarship or financial aids officer of the college.

---

[14] All American Indian self-report statistics are subject to error, since many persons identify as Indians who are not clearly recognized as Indians.

In order to supplement their income from financial aid programs, many EOP students have to work 20 hours a week or more.

One of the most articulate statements about State College EOP programs was made by Kenneth S. Washington, President of the California Council for Educational Opportunity, Inc. and State College coordinator for EOP programs, who stated:

> EOP provides the following:
>
> A. Recruitment: The Directors, with the assistance of their staff, the college community, the service area community, and now state agencies, actively pursue those minority and low income students who display academic potential.
>
> B. Admissions Assistance: Candidates for the program are shepherded through the many steps necessary to gain admission. Most Directors are responsible for obtaining all of the admissions material which constitute the "packet" from which final decisions are made. The Directors then sit as a member of the screening committees that select from the total pool of applicants.
>
> C. Financial Aid: Though each college has its separate financial aids office, the EOP program has the responsibility of assuring that each student has an aid package that meets his particular needs. Often each individual student requires "tailoring" of his aid because his unique needs fit no pattern. Many EOP students experience a change in need during the year and the program has the responsibility of meeting that change.
>
> D. Tutoring: Every EOP student has a tutor whose responsibility is to insure academic success. The processes used vary widely, but the underlying theme is to render the necessary assistance to the student before the instructor knows he needs it. Quite apparently, this function often goes beyond the classroom issues and incorporates the total college adjustment.
>
> E. Counseling: The cultural shock experienced, that is compounded by the academic demands, often creates stresses which require a competence greater than that provided by tutors. The counseling is provided by those who are particularly sensitive to the unique needs and backgrounds of the EOP population.
>
> F. Housing: One of the defeating elements common to most EOP students is the anti-intellectual community from which they come. Where possible, the EOP activities incorporate a housing service which locates the student (either on or off campus) where he can study.
>
> G. Health Referrals: Most EOP students are unaware of the health facilities and services available in their new environment. EOP must be the liaison between the service and the need.

H. Job Placement: The current financial aid packages meet the needs of students for the ten month academic year only. Students engrossed in studies find it difficult to arrange summer employment. EOP services many of its students in both soliciting vacation-holiday employment and student referrals.

I. Program Coordination: EOP must fit within the on-going operation of the college. Where the traditional practices on the campus have conflicted with the new requirements of EOP and its students, many adjustments have been made. All colleges will attest to their new-found flexibility that has resulted from the presence of EOP.

J. Other Involvement: The EOP Director is required to perform a variety of other tasks from being the minority representative on campus to solving the problem of a student's flat tire.

In our on-site interviews with EOP directors, we were told that financial aid programs are handled by the regular college Financial Aids Office, and that, in general, things work smoothly between these different segments. Two directors told us that they do not learn how large their budgets will be far enough in advance of the academic year to adequately plan for the coming year (the Federal government tells them in June, and the state in July, so that there is not sufficient planning time for the Sept. school opening).

In our discussions with state college EOP directors we found them to be particularly concerned with the black-Chicano identity questions. The same discussion is pertinent to the University and will no doubt be raised once the Community College programs develop. Several state colleges have two co-directors, one black, one Chicano. They feel that the ethnic identity question is a very important one, and that EOP students need to relate to an EOP Director from the same ethnic background. The interviews with students also revealed these feelings. The competition between black and Chicano groups for their "fair share" or for "parity" of EOP "slots and funds" is very active, and, at times, rivalrous. In other schools, there is cooperation, albeit from separate identity positions.

Some EOP directors are deeply involved in colleague relationships with ethnic studies departments, others are not. Nearly all EOP directors do respond and relate to the black and Chicano student organizations (BSU and UMAS) who play a considerable role in recruiting minority students. In some cases, a committee from these organizations sits with the EOP director and actually selects the EOP students. Thus, on state college campuses where the student organizations are the most militant and active, the recruitment, selection and retention of EOP students is often influenced directly by these student groups.

Student interviews revealed that nearly all state college EOP students were facing overwhelming financial difficulties. To many, EOP meant a pathway to funds; most had to work and did not use tutoring or counseling because of lack of time. Many were so overwhelmed with personal and financial difficulties that it was a miracle that they could attend school.

Certainly several of the EOP students interviewed did not fit the stereotype of a typical state college student.

For example, one Chicano boy entered a state college after spending "years on the streets." He had been arrested for narcotics and was on parole. He had been recruited by a VISTA Volunteer, and had become an active participant in a self-help narcotic rehabilitation program. He felt that the EOP program was "beautiful" and that without it, college would have been impossible. He lives on campus where his biggest problem continues to be financial, although he is having some coursework difficulty. He continues his active involvement in the community self-help organization and looks forward to social work or teaching.

Another student is a 17 year old black girl, attending school while living at home with her welfare family and her own baby. Without the EOP program she would be on welfare, without a chance to break out of the cycle of poverty. Her financial situation is critical, since her family is without adequate funds, and she contributes all her EOP money, so that she needs books and extra money. She wants to be a teacher and feels that she will be able to help her own family and other black people in this way.

A young Chicano girl, age 18, comes from a family of nine children. She cannot believe her "good fortune at being here." Her father violently objects to her attending school, and she had to move in with her grandparents in order to keep attending. Her financial need is very great -- she has no funds for transportation, books, etc. Despite her serious financial problem, she feels optimistic and hopes to be a teacher of Mexican American studies.

All students told us of their financial difficulties which overshadow much of their college life. The difficulties appear to be of two kinds: (1) lack of funds and (2) uncertainty of continued support.

Many state college EOP students talked with us about the "Harmer Bill", which they feel is very limiting, and which is shattering the morale of many EOP directors and students. Some students expressed concern about this study (as did several EOP Directors). They feel this study is an "excuse" for the Legislature to make further cuts and changes in the EOP programs, and some feel that major student riots will occur unless the black and Chicano programs are expanded and the EOP program continues. In general, among all persons interviewed in the state colleges, there were more political concerns expressed than was true of the university groups. On two of the state college campuses where student disturbances have occurred in the past, we found a high level of distrust and threat expressed about potential cut-backs in college admission and support programs for minority students. The uncertainty of the EOP programs is a major factor in the uneasy morale expressed by students and staff.

Academic Problems: Most EOP students attending state colleges carry at least 12 hours course work and most work another 15 or 20 hours a week. Many had low grades in high school and had trouble accepting the self-discipline of study. They utilized counseling and tutoring services very sparingly, but did help each other a great deal. Many had friends among other EOP students, or other minority students who helped them informally with their studies.

In addition to their academic problems, many EOP students were heavily involved in family difficulties. Some were under pressure to drop out and assist their families by taking a job. In short, the life style of poverty is such that attending college becomes a very major shift and creates many conflicting problems for EOP students. Some students were in need of help with basic learning skills, such as English or Math. As one student told us: "When you don't have time to study, because you work too hard, all the counselors in the world can't help you then."

One 20 year old Chinese girl is majoring in Social Welfare. She badly needs tutoring, but is working 12 hours a week, and finds that because of her hours, she doesn't have time to arrange tutoring. She is so worried about personal problems (conflict with her family) and her poor financial situation that she seems depressed. She feels the counseling she received didn't help her, but that she must work out her problems alone. She felt there was a real lack of a community atmosphere in the dorms, and she feels isolated and alienated in college life.

Another Chinese girl, age 20, stated that she came to school "to learn - I didn't want to be a common girl." She is in computer science, and is having trouble academically. She is thinking of changing majors to sociology. She receives one hour of tutoring every two weeks, which she feels isn't effective. She said that tutors have too little time to spend, and too many students to tutor.

Recruitment Programs: Most state college EOP directors conduct some form of recruitment program, although they do not feel they have adequate enrollment places for all-the qualified students who are seeking out the EOP program now. They consider 80% of all applications received, but are able to admit only 40% of all considered applicants within the admissions exceptions. They admit through regular admission 12% of all applicants considered.

The selection process varies from school to school, but the EOP directors described several procedures used for EOP selection. They try to get students who are "motivated". One EOP director used, as a criteria, whether or not an applicant showed a willingness "to use supportive services and to accept student responsibility." Given the large recruitment pool, EOP selection can be used to bring in students with a high potential to "succeed." That is, EOP directors continue to search for EOP students who, despite a poor academic history, will be able to "make it." The student who demonstrates potential for "success", by whatever criterion used, will be the one most likely to be selected from among all applicants.

In some state colleges, as previously stated, the actual recruitment and selection is carried out by the minority student organizations with the EOP director's participation.

We asked students how they were recruited, and 60% told us they heard of EOP through friends, and then talked with EOP "recruiters." About one-fourth of the students had been referred by the formal network, i.e., by a high school counselor or by a state college recruiter. Another group learned of EOP through a family member (an older brother, etc.) who was involved at college. EOP students themselves actively recruit their friends or family. But their financial disillusion, and their fear of the termination of EOP may limit their future recruiting until the situation is somewhat stabilized.

It would appear that the recruitment process is no longer as crucial as it has been in the past, although it seems likely that many minority students remain unaware of its existence. Nevertheless, because of the large number of applications received each year, most EOP directors have to turn away many students they would have chosen for EOP.

Retention Programs -- Tutoring and Counseling: Most EOP directors express great concern about these support programs and feel that without them, EOP students would be unable to continue in school.

It is beyond the scope of this study to fully evaluate the impact of such programs in EOP. Some EOP directors have considered developing a research study of EOP services, but seem overly-sensitive about "drop-out rates" or "failure." In general, a simple drop-out study would not adequately evaluate the EOP program results. Most of the students we saw in state colleges would never have been able to attend without special encouragement and financial support. Further, many of these young people are so overwhelmed with personal, family and financial problems not found among white middle-class college students that the fact they remain in college even for a year is in itself remarkable.

Still, the proportion of EOP students is far too small in relation to the total minority population. Efforts should be greatly accelerated in order to bring more minority and/or low income students into state colleges. For, as we have been noted, it is the college life, and all it means, that may be able to create a major change in such students' lives. What seems to matter most is that the students have an opportunity to gather in a stimulating, hopeful environment, meet bright and interesting people, have adequate support, without worry, and have open access to interesting, knowledgeable teachers who will challenge and direct their studies. The EOP Program, as a pioneering effort to bridge between two societies in this country has succeeded in opening up a small side door into college and university life for a few persons out of the large minority and/or low income populations of the state. As a symbol it has been very significant, but as a remedy to the racial imbalance in education, it has been too little, too late.

In interviews with other state college students and faculty, we learned that EOP has afforded them with challenges and opportunities. Its symbolic meaning captured the interest and imagination of much of the state college community. The EOP program has, in general, been widely supported by the students and most of the faculty. Some faculty told us that the EOP students in their classes were not as able to express themselves in writing as were other students, but their verbal ability and their own increasing ability to learn and perform in the system showed them to be potentially able to achieve at an appropriate level. In addition, they injected ideas, questions and a new vitality; they showed the faculty and administration that changes are needed and can occur quickly and that colleges can respond to real issues. They indicated that even those faculty members who had been opposed to "lowering admissions standards" were not favorably disposed.

However, it appears that many faculty members, while sympathetic with the EOP, have not been actually involved in the program itself in terms of numbers, procedures, etc. Other faculty are concerned with maintaining "standards" and "order" which they feel that EOP students may violate.[15] This brief survey could not evaluate the faculty attitudes in depth. These would seem to be a very important factor in the college climate and effect upon EOP, and could well be the subject for further study.

The state college EOP programs have become associated over the past two years with student disorders, at least in some of the public's mind. At two state colleges, there were major student disturbances in 1968-69. For example, 339 students were arrested at San Francisco State College. Only a few were EOP students; most arrested students were white, middle-class students (incidentally drawn from the intellectually elite on campus). Many persons studying student disturbances have pointed out that the causes of such disturbances are diffuse, and not due to "outside agitation." Academically motivated minority students are very concerned with the types of education which they found in colleges, once admission barriers were bridged. They found many disappointing courses, many ethnically and historically biased concepts, and minority students (in colleagueship with white students) everywhere have sought major changes in college curricula and priorities. American Indian students, for example, demanded a change in the teaching of American history (for them, Columbus did not "discover" America).

One national study[16] found that during the school year 1968-69, that only 8% of the black students and 4% of the white students (in schools surveyed) participated in demonstrations.

---

[15] While our data is only suggestive, another study has found that administrators and staff tend to be more supportive of "desegregating" the campus than are faculty. Egerton, op.cit., found "a real strong feeling among some professors that letting in more disadvantaged students would lower the prestige of an institution." For example, Lloyd G. Humphreys, a professor in Psychology at University of Illinois, wrote in Science , October 10, 1969, the following (Letters) p. 167. "There is only one Negro to every 30 Caucasian on a nationwide basis who is in the top 25% of our population (where universities draw their students). In order to obtain more than a token number of Negro undergraduates, admission standards have to be substantially lowered. When this is coupled with the present severe competition for qualified Negroes, and a crash recruitment program, student quality may deteriorate substantially."

[16] Bayer, Alen E. and Robert F. Baruch, The Black Student in American Colleges, ACE Research Report, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1969.

The first complete national study of college protests last year at colleges and universities shows that most were non-violent and did not disrupt campus routine.[17] Almost one-half of those protests concerned demands by students for such concessions as black studies, more black faculty members and students and better facilities. In 49% of the protests, at least one black demand was met.

In California State Colleges, both the black and the Chicano students are actively concerned with correcting the racial imbalance in colleges, and in improving the college curriculum and facilities so that they may obtain a culturally viable education. These demands will most likely continue, given the present racial imbalance on State College campuses.

---

[17] John Naisbitt, Urban Research Corp. of Chicago, as reported in the San Francisco Chronicle, Jan. 14, 1970.

CHAPTER III

COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES: PROGRAMS FOR MINORITY AND/OR LOW INCOME STUDENTS

In 1968, California graduated 256,236 students from its high schools, of whom between 60% and 80% can be expected to attend college. Most of these graduates will enter one of California's community colleges, which today also serve in excess of 300,000 full-time students. The community colleges also serve over 250,000 additional students in adult or evening part-time courses. Most of California's minority students attend community colleges. (See following table.) These community colleges have "open admissions" policies, but do give basic reading and comprehension tests to entering students.

Remedial education is a major function of the community colleges,[1] since many entering students cannot pass these reading and comprehension tests. This remedial function of community colleges has aroused many questions, the most serious being their effectiveness. For example, Berg[2] stated that the lack of self-conscious evaluation of these remedial programs remains as a significant indictment of the open door policy.

Rauche[3] concludes that "available research will not support the contention that community colleges offer programs that, in fact, remedy student deficiencies." Some of these problems need further study, particularly since so many minority and low-income students will be entering the community college as their first contact with the system of higher education.

Of the graduating high school seniors, approximately 44,560 are from a minority group; of these 33,420 would not be educationally eligible to attend either a state college or the university but could be admitted to a community college. In fact, of all graduating seniors,

---

1. Statement of Gerald D. Cresci, Dean of Special Programs, to Assembly Ways and Means Subcommittee on Education, Dec. 4, 1969.

2. Berg, E. H., "Selected Factors Bearing on the Persistence and Academic Performance of Low Ability Students in Four California Junior Colleges" (doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1963).

3. Rauche, John, Salvage, Redirection or Custody?, Washington AAJC, 1968, p. 47.

TABLE I: ENROLLMENT IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES; MINORITY STUDENTS AND STUDENTS WITH FAMILY INCOMES OF LESS THAN $5,000

Community college	Minority students		Students with income of less than $5,000		Total full-time enrollment
	N	%	N	%	
Golden West College	251	6.2	409	10.1	4,053
Long Beach City College	1,526	11.4	506	3.8	13,363
Mt. San Antonio College	1,357	18.7	661	9.1	7,248
Santa Barbara City College	544	14.5	370	9.8	3,762
Laney College	3,340	49.7	2,000	29.8	6,715
Feather River College	26	19.2	25	18.5	135
Merritt College	3,224	51.0	1,074	17.0	6,322
Chaffey College	456	11.3	443	11.0	4,027
Riverside City College	544	11.8	210	4.6	4,603
Bakersfield College	909	16.6	811	14.8	5,462
San Jose City College	1,324	23.2	778	13.6	5,706
Hartnell College	581	29.3	87	4.4	1,981
City College of San Francisco	5,605	50.7	2,107	19.0	11,060
College of the Sequoias	704	24.0	733	25.0	2,934
Contra Costa College	1,346	34.6	975	25.1	3,888
Lassen College	85	7.3	111	9.5	1,163
Butte College	45	2.3	300	15.1	1,990
Cuesta College	116	6.8	35	2.0	1,708
Diablo Valley College	423	5.6	1,100	14.6	7,556
Foothill College	462	9.1	154	3.0	5,062
Glendale College	172	5.0	88	2.6	3,405
Ventura College	464	15.6	154	5.2	2,966
Santa Ana College	577	15.3	189	5.0	3,781
Citrus College	440	12.5	200	5.7	3,511
San Diego Mesa College	567	8.1	1,718	24.5	7,012
San Bernardino Valley College	1,204	19.0	600	9.4	6,351
San Mateo Junior College District					
College of San Mateo Canada College Skyline College	1,444	11.7	1,500	12.2	12,304
Southwestern College	435	12.9	145	4.3	3,376
Mt. San Jacinto College	123	15.2	525	64.9	809
Shasta College	202	7.1	66	2.3	2,854
Gavilan	408	34.9	148	12.7	1,169
San Diego City College	1,027	25.9	600	15.1	3,965
College of Marin	306	6.5	1,571	33.3	4,714
Merced College	680	31.8	662	31.0	2,135
Imperial Valley College	547	42.3	272	21.0	1,293
Pasadena City College	940	15.5	1,213	20.0	6,064

TABLE I: ENROLLMENT IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES
(Continued)

Community College	Minority students		Students with income of less than $5,000		Total full-time enrollment
	N	%	N	%	
Victor Valley College	49	10.1	73	15.0	487
Santa Rosa Junior College	339	9.8	880	25.4	3,469
Columbia Junior College	106	12.3	198	23.0	860
Modesto Junior College	500	10.0	1,506	30.0	5,020
Reedley College	479	29.1	360	21.9	1,646
Napa College	183	5.5	61	1.8	3,333
San Joaquin Delta College	1,644	28.0	550	9.4	5,869
American River College	321	3.8	75	0.9	8,379
Sacramento City College	2,125	25.9	2,017	24.6	8,195
Fresno City College	1,513	22.5	1,278	19.0	6,728
Orange Coast College	214	2.7	71	0.9	7,838
Cypress College	273	7.5	35	1.0	3,634
Fullerton Junior College	779	8.03	52	0.6	9,382
Compton College	1,657	60.6	656	24.0	2,735
Monterey Peninsula College	617	22.2	572	20.6	2,774
Yuba College	324	13.8	482	20.6	2,342
El Camino College	1,724	16.2	1,433	13.5	10,615
Chabot College	1,243	18.0	300	4.3	6,919
Rio Hondo College	629	13.2	570	12.0	4,754
Palomar College	113	4.1	377	13.7	2,754
De Anza College	431	9.0	402	8.4	4,788
Santa Monica City College	795	10.6	448	6.0	7,465
Los Angeles City College	5,058	49.0	1,618	15.7	10,323
Los Angeles Harbor College	1,755	31.9	70	1.3	5,502
East Los Angeles College	3,343	47.3	1,114	15.8	7,072
Los Angeles Pierce College	525	8.1	280	4.3	6,451
Los Angeles Southwest College	1,500	95.2	300	19.0	1,575
Los Angeles Trade-Technical College	3,124	58.0	923	17.1	5,386
Los Angeles Valley College	940	9.6	930	9.5	9,791
West Los Angeles College	460	22.7	202	10.0	2,022
Moorpark College	265	11.2	285	12.0	2,375
Cerritos College	739	10.5	246	3.5	7,041
Solano College	516	16.1	840	26.2	3,207
West Valley College	258	6.0	86	2.0	4,300
Cabrillo College	362	10.6	121	3.6	3,402
	67,307	19.6	41,851	12.2	342,880*

*Community College estimates.

SOURCE: Dean of Special Programs, California Community Colleges.

approximately 60% or 156,000 can be expected to attend college, and about 70% or 109,200 of these (whether educationally prepared or not) can be expected to enter one of California's community colleges.[4]

There are presently 90 operational community colleges in California, serving some 300,000 full-time students. It has been estimated that in these colleges at least 20% of the students are from minority and low-income groups.

Recent legislation (the Alquist Bill, SB 164) provided funds for "extended opportunity programs" and services in the community colleges. The extended opportunity program, as defined, is an undertaking by a community college which is over, above, and in addition to the regular educational programs of the college, having as its purpose the provisions of positive encouragement directed to the enrollment of students handicapped by language, social and economic disadvantages, and to the facilitation of their successful participation in the educational pursuits of the college.

Seventy-four community colleges applied for projects under the 1969-1970 appropriation, totaling approximately $10 million, of which only $2,679,641 was appropriated to program requests. About one-half of those who applied (37 of the 74 community colleges) received funds and these 37 community colleges actually received approximately one-third of the amount they requested. Overall, there were only funds available from the state to meet one-fourth of the total requests from all colleges.

In order to study each community college's special programs for the disadvantaged students, a questionnaire was sent to each school. Of these, 51 schools returned the forms by time of writing, describing their programs, plans and problems (see Appendix for copy of questionnaire).

Community colleges are multi-purpose institutions and might be thought of as having four parts: 1) a developmental, remedial function; 2) an adult education center; 3) a technical and occupational center and 4) a two-year transfer college.[5]

Most studies of the junior college have noted that there was a great deal of focus on the "transfer" function of the college, as opposed to its "terminal" or vocational function. That is, the teachers in junior colleges gain status and satisfaction by teaching students who plan to enter a regular four-year college or university after junior college.[6]

---

4. These computations are also verified by Coleman, et.al., Equality of Educational Opportunity, U.S. Office of Education, 1966, Table 5. p.445

5. See Dorothy M. Knoell and Leland G. Medsker, From Junior to Senior College, American Council on Education, 1965, for a full discussion of these functions on the "terminal" and "transfer" function of junior colleges.

6. See the discussion in Leland Medsker, The Junior College: Progress and

Other studies[7] seem to point to the local junior college as an extension of high school, as an institution which would "cool out" those students who were not academically able to go on in higher education.

Most community colleges either now have, or are planning to establish some type of special program for minority students, such as recruitment, work-study, counseling and tutoring programs. Each community college contacted stated their need for additional funds to enlarge these programs.

The definition of a special program in the community colleges is one which serves the following:

> "The disadvantaged student is one who, because of home and community environment, is subject to such language, cultural, or economic differences that will make improbable his academic success in relation to his potential without special efforts on the part of the community college."[8]

Dean Cresci also states that: "Community colleges are available to all students and are structured to provide effective service to students less likely to be served adequately by other segments of higher education." Thus, special programs appear to be necessary if "disadvantaged" students are to enter college.

---

6. Cont. Prospect, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1960. He found, for example, that over one-half of all junior college teachers would prefer to teach in a four-year college or university. Approximately three-fourths of the teachers rated the transfer function as "very important," while only one-fourth rated the remedial teaching as being "very important," and 2/3 rated vocational training as "very important." These findings may indicate that most junior college teachers place the transfer function high, the terminal next, but rate the remedial function low.

7. See Burton Clark, American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 65 (1956), pp. 569-576, who states that students are culled out by a long process of pre-entrance testing, remedial classes and counseling for "alternatives." He states that the remedial courses "are, in effect, a subcollege." (p. 571) As a further example of the junior college image, one of the students interviewed in this study called them "high schools with ash trays." Another black student who was interviewed stated, "black people going to J.C. just get messed over, encouraged to take technical courses and not to continue college."

8. From statement of Dr. Gerald D. Cresci, Dean of Special Programs, California Community Colleges, Assembly Ways and Means Subcommittee on Education, December 4, 1969.

Who are the disadvantaged students and why do they need special programs to enter an "open door" community college?[9]

For purposes of this report, the focus is on the community college programs with full-time day students. The adult evening classes often account for one-half to one-third of the entire enrollment of a community college. It is difficult to evaluate the overall effect of such a program on the school atmosphere and goals. One community college we studied in depth was using their adult education program to reach out to parents of minority children who might be recruited into regular classes. It was a novel experiment to see whether, by changing the value of education in the parents' life, they could increase the likelihood of the child's attending college.

Report of the Survey

The questionnaire-survey asked each community college to describe the various programs underway for the minority and/or low-income student. Of the schools replying most had two or more programs, e.g., financial aid and counseling or remedial courses and tutoring, etc. Ten percent of the community colleges had no special programs but all indicated an interest in developing some type of program if funds were available.

The following are the types of special programs for disadvantaged students offered by the community colleges:

Recruitment in Community	45%
Recruitment in High School	61%
Tutorial Program	61%
Counseling Program	57%
Remedial Program	25%
Vocational Program	13%
Financial Aids	45%
No special program	10%

The financial aid package, when available at all, averaged only \$250-\$300 per year; and the work-study program, when available, averaged \$500 per year per student. Only a few schools reported any special employment or housing services available to disadvantaged students. In slightly over one-half the schools, there was a program of on-campus tutoring for minority students.

---

[9] For purposes of this report, our data consists of the analysis of official documents and reports, interviews with community college staff and students, questionnaires and on-site visits to 24 schools, scattered geographically and sampled for various demographic factors, urban and rural; north and south, large and small, etc. In addition, we obtained data from the Nor-Cal project, directed by Dr. Thomas MacMillan, which covers 22 community colleges in Northern California, utilizing student data on all full-time day freshmen students (N=22,258 students).

As for staffing these special programs, one-half of the schools had a special counselor for minority students, and one-half had a special administrative position which dealt with minority or disadvantaged students. Only four schools, those with programs, reported a special staff position for a financial aids assistant for these programs. In general, most "disadvantaged" students were considered on the same status as all community college students.

In terms of the ethnicity of the special staff (N=64) located in these community colleges, one-third were Black, one-third Chicano and one-third white. In some of the larger community colleges, two staff members would be involved in the special programs, one Black, one Chicano. Most (76%) of the larger schools offered some type of ethnic studies programs although the courses varied widely throughout the system. Usually their studies were scattered throughout the various departments of history, psychology, sociology, art, etc. As the minority enrollment increases, undoubtedly new emphasis will be put upon the further development of such courses.

In this study overall enrollment in the 51 community colleges had increased 26% in the years 1968-69 and the enrollment of Blacks had increased 26%, Chicanos 15%, Asians 23%, American Indians 58%, and whites 25%. The present ethnic distribution among the community college student body is as follows:

	Community College Distribution	California Population Distribution (1967 est.)
White	81%	78.8%
Chicano	6%	11.1%
Black	5%	7.2%
Asian	5%	2.0%
Other	4%	.9%

Among the 51 community colleges reporting on the questionnaire, there were 13,768 Black students; 18,862 Chicano students; 1,449 American Indian students out of the 254,419 students currently enrolled. According to the Nor-Cal Study[10] two-thirds would be enrolled in transfer courses. While there are no ethnic differences between transfer and terminal students, there were ethnic differences in majors. White students were likely to major in Business Administration, Engineering and Art; Black students in Sociology, Data Processing and Radio-TV; the Chicano students majored in Data Processing, Secretarial Skills and Sociology, while Asian students majored in Engineering, Accounting and Business Administration.

When students in the Nor-Cal survey were asked what obstacles might cause them to drop out, 42% of the Blacks, 33% of the Chicanos and 28% of the whites mentioned financial hardship.

---

[10] This data is derived from the Nor-Cal project and reports on 22,258 students enrolled in Fall 1969 in 22 community colleges. (Data courtesy of Dr. Tom MacMillan,Napa College.) This is a cooperative study of the characteristics and attitudes of freshmen enrolling at 22 community colleges in northern California; these students appear to be representative of the total community college population.

Among Blacks, 8% felt academic problems, 7% felt lack of motivation might be obstacles, while among Chicanos 12% felt academic problems and 12% felt motivational problems might lead them to drop out.

Over one-half of the Blacks and 40% of the Chicanos, as contrasted with 18% of the white students, stated they would require financial aid if they were to be able to remain in college. In fact, 42% of all students were employed nearly full-time while attending the community college; 14% of the Blacks and 7% of the Chicanos were married and supporting, in part, a family while in college (7% of the whites were also married).

As to the socio-economic background of community college students, the Nor-Cal study findings reveal that while one-half of the white students' parents are "blue collar" workers, three-fourths of the fathers of Black and Chicano students are blue collar workers. In fact, nearly 10% of the Black and 5% of the Chicano students come from families where the head of the household is unemployed or on welfare.

Even more crucial to many college students, as shown by other studies, is the value system within their family. One of the best predictors of college success is that of the college identity of an individual's parents. If a student's parents expect him to go to college, as they did, it is likely the child will go. Among many families in the minority community, the possibility or the expectation that a child would attend college is indeed remote, and may rank low in comparison to the need for employment and support. For example, among the minority students we interviewed, several were under pressure from their families to drop out and help support their younger siblings and family. Therefore, the attitude and the expectation of the student's family may be more crucial to his college career than socio-economic status per se. From the Nor-Cal survey, each student was asked how important college was to him, and how important attending college was to his father. Among white students, 52% said attending college was important to them but 70% said attending college was important to their fathers. Among Black students, the situation was nearly reversed, i.e., 69% of the Black students said college was important to them but it was important to their fathers in only 53% of the cases. Among Chicano students 56% stated that college was very important to them and 65% stated that it was also very important to their fathers. Thus, white and Chicano students rated the importance of their attending college higher for their fathers than for themselves while among Blacks the relationship was reversed, i.e., Black students felt it was more important to themselves to attend college than to their fathers. Such findings may reflect the different family and cultural patterns in the groups and suggest that different supports and programs may be needed for these different motivational situations.

In the survey of 51 community colleges the respondents estimated that on the average, 22% of the white students and 28% of the minority students dropped out after their first year at a community college. The estimated dropout rate for Blacks and Chicanos is one-third greater than that for Asian students who, in general, have about the same college career pattern as do white students. Thus, more minority students fail to transfer and actually leave the community colleges than is true for white students. These dropout rates appear to be related to a number of social and psychological factors aside from ability or I.Q.

Interviews

Interviews were held with 40 minority students in six community colleges both rural and urban. These students were divided in their evaluation of their community college experience. Some felt that the college was just another type of large high school, the teachers dull, the courses irrelevant and the climate unfavorable to minority students. Others felt that they were being prepared for college, but felt extremely discouraged about their financial situation.

> For example, a Black female student, age 18, from a strongly religious family, (the mother a domestic, the father a janitor), was interviewed about the community college she attended. She stated that she had been told she would receive financial assistance in the college until she could transfer, i.e., "a free way through college." She has found, however, that she does not get enough to live on, even with a part-time job. She has little time to study, must spend 2 hours a day on public transportation to live at home. Her grades are average, but she feels she needs a special tutor in English. This is not available at her school, and she states she will not attend remedial classes which "only mess up your mind" and make a junior college take three years instead of two. She does not feel she will be prepared for a transfer because of the high school atmosphere and the limited black studies or relevant classes. She felt the few ethnic teachers were "Negro" rather than"Black," and was obviously growing disillusioned with the program.

Another Black student, a Vietnam veteran, age 26, attends a community college in a California city. He was told that he would get a "paid education," but has found the financial aid very inadequate and stated that it was unrealistic to expect to go to college and not to worry about money. He felt that junior college preparation for college could be sufficient but complained of the "heaviness" of the minds of both faculty and students.

Another Black male, age 22, believed that he has received very limited financial aid because he has been "political." He feels that he is not receiving adequate financial aid or administrative encouragement.

Interviews were held with a number of EOP students at State Colleges and universities who had been transfer students from a junior college. They were asked to evaluate their own experience of transferring from a community college to a State College or university and some of their replies are as follows:

A Chicano-Navaho girl, age 19, transferred into a State College after one year in a junior college. She felt that, in general, the community college courses had been beneficial in preparing her for transfer, although the atmosphere there had been more like a large high school rather than a college. A recruiter had visited her community college and had offered her housing, fees, books and tutorial assistance. She stated she received this assistance and complained that the housing (dorm life) was not satisfactory to her.

A 20 year old Chicano male transferred to a State College after junior college, because he felt isolated intellectually, and because no courses were offered in ethnic studies or in "relevant" areas.

A 32 year old Chicano woman with a family of four, transferred to a State College from a junior college. She felt she had not received a true picture of a four-year college, the atmosphere in the junior college had been that of an "overblown high school."

A Black female, age 23, attended an urban community college. She felt it was a good experience, and prepared her for studying, and for what to expect of college professors, as well as the ins and outs of college life. She felt it "got her in the groove of things."

In general, transfer students felt both positive and negative about their community college experiences prior to transfer, and the factors which separated the two opinion groups were the type of community college program (urban-rural, ethnic studies or not) and the maturity and characteristics of the student (age, marital status, middle-class vs. lower class).

Evaluation of Community Colleges Special Programs:

Due to the short time the special programs (under the Alquist Bill) have been in progress, it is not possible to gather systematic evaluative data. Very little consistent research has been done in follow-up or re-enrollment studies of community colleges. The Nor-Cal data utilized in this report is one of the better attempts to evaluate the careers and attitudes of community college students, but it is not yet completed. One report states that 60% of all those who enroll as freshmen do not enroll as sophomores.

Thus, all evaluative statements in this report arise from the on-site visits and the survey data.

Since EOP in the universities and State Colleges involves special admissions, it would seem logical that minority and/or low income students would be able to enter community colleges without difficulty due to their "open admissions" policy. But many such students find that they must enter remedial classes, and that it will require three years to complete the two-year transfer course. As stated previously, very little is known about the effectiveness of remedial classes, but it would appear that many students become disillusioned and drop out. Others channel their interest into the occupational or vocational courses which are an important aspect of community college life.

One EOP director at a State College has labeled the community college a vast EOP program which has failed. Such criticism seems to stem from the feeling that community colleges are second-rate educational institutions for second-class citizens. These views are held by many minority leaders in the academic community, although the actual research data is not available for empirical validation of such opinions.

Most all of the objections to utilizing community colleges exclusively for minority and/or low income students have been succinctly stated by Kenneth S. Washington in his role of President of the California Council for Educational Opportunity,[11] and we quote his major points:

A. Community colleges will become "ghetto" institutions. Most EOP students are products of the ghettos and barrios of our inner cities. By providing the major number of opportunities in two-year colleges, most minority students will be forced into community colleges. Colleges are defined by its student mix and, therefore, will acquire a "second class" label as its minority population increases.

---

[11] See his memo "Educational Opportunity Programs in the Junior College," Dec. 1969.

B. Community college students must attend the college in their residential area. They therefore are unable to escape those anti-intellectual forces in the community and the home. Current evidence indicates that a change in environment can easily produce a change in academic achievement.

C. Community Colleges average cost is $800 per student as compared to $1500 per student in the State College and $2500 in the University. Whether true or not, two-year college students believe they are receiving an inferior education. Thus being forced to attend a community college will breed additional resentment and frustration.

D. The transition from an inner city secondary school to higher education is fraught with anxiety and trepidation. EOP students who are victimized by inferior social, economic, and educational aspects are further injured by demanding two--rather than one--adjustment in post secondary education.

E. Most junior college classes are purposely overenrolled. The anticipated drop out will reduce the classes to the desired size. Any effort to retain students (EOP) will simply mitigate against the existing practice. If the college strives to retain those identified as EOP and loses the others, a very serious moral judgment arises about who is chosen.

F. To contend that because everyone can go to a community college, that the community college can contain everyone is fallacious. Thousands of students are turned away because classes are closed. With enrollment restrictions on the University and the State Colleges, the problem becomes more grave.

G. The University and the State College are supported largely from state funds. The community colleges are supported by local tax funds. (State support for junior colleges is 17 percent.)* Devising a program where large numbers of students are denied admission to the University and State Colleges and forced into community colleges, moves the cost from Sacramento to the local property owner. For instance, if X junior college recruits and retains 300 EOP students, the cost to the State may well be $70,000 for program support, but the cost of educating ($800 per student) will be $240,000 to be paid by the local taxpayer.

H. Finally, the consensus of the observers of community colleges (with notable exceptions) is that the colleges perceive their role as "screeners" of students--custodians

---

* Editor's note: On a statewide basis state support is approximately 32%.

> of the gates of four year institutions. Whereas, EOP attempts to identify losers with potential--support and develop the hidden talent--community colleges attempt to retain the talented and discourage the rest. These two patterns are inimical.

Such objections deserve careful research and classification. For example, it is not clear that students, families, and communities see the community college as "second-class" or "inferior" education. The fact is that most all California college students attend a community college, and that as many as one-third of all State College admissions are community college transfers. The facts are that community colleges have so many different functions, in so many communities, serving so many different populations, that an overall evaluation is impossible without further specification.

Other studies have shown that the composite picture reveals a pattern of generally lower academic aptitude, generally less strong committment to ideas, and generally greater diversity of socio-economic status than would be representative of a four year college. These studies[12] reveal that community college students average one-half a standard deviation below four-year college freshmen; the average junior college freshman would rank at about the 30th percentile of the four year group." Cross reported that among community college freshmen one-fourth did not expect to get a BA, 45% wanted a BA, and 24% expected to go on to graduate school, as compared with four year colleges where 15% expected to leave before the BA, 51% at the BA, and 34% to go on to graduate school.

Other studies have stated that one of the major problems in community colleges resides in the "way community college faculty are trained and the kind of image such faculty would like the two year college to acquire.[13] Medsker[14] found that community college teachers could be described as follows:

9% had doctorates
50% formerly taught in high school
27% had attended junior college
50% wanted to teach in four year college
75% were "satisfied with their job"
28% did not like to teach remedial classes.

Such findings appear to present some evidence that the educational climate is less than "academic."

---

[12] See Hoyt, Donald P. and Munday, Leo, Academic Description and Prediction in Junior Colleges, ACT, Research Report, No. 10, Feb. 1966(p. 14); Patricia K. Cross, The Junior College Student: A Research Description, Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1968; Thomas MacMillan, Norcal Project: Phase I, 1969 (mimeo).

[13] The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, Progress Report, 1965-1969.

[14] See Leland Medsker, The Junior College: Progress and Prospect, Op.Cit., 1967.

Our survey asked each respondent to comment on problems in the community college programs. For example, each interviewee, students, staff, faculty, etc., were asked to evaluate their problems in meeting the needs of minority and/or low-income students in the community colleges.

The first problem was lack of funds, i.e., minority students were without adequate funds and often had to work full time to support themselves. Staff felt they did not have adequate funds to develop special programs, but were "scratching" out of existing pockets of services and funds.

Other problems mentioned were those involving establishing or extending relationships into the minority community. Some programs sought to recruit students from the adult training classes, some located in the minority community. ("If you teach the parent, you can recruit the child.")

Housing and transportation were also mentioned as problems, and the need for extended work-study plans.

In short, the problems varied widely, as did the opinions of staff and students.

A content-analysis of the community college minority student interviews reveals the following:

1. All students were experiencing great financial hardships, e.g., some were actually using their school funds to help support their families.

2. All students complained about the lack of adequate housing, i.e., it was too expensive or racially segregated.

3. Public transportation was inadequate; almost all found transportation to be a problem.

4. Nearly all students complained about the bureaucratic structure, and indicated a lack of confidence in administrators of their programs. All indicated great insecurity about the continuation of the EOP programs.

5. Most minority students turned to members of their own minority groups for counseling and tutoring rather than using the "official" programs, and felt this "informal" tutoring was of the greatest benefit as compared with the regular counseling system.

6. Most all students were recruited by being told they would get to go to college "free", and now feel disillusioned and betrayed because of their financial problems.

7. Many students find the courses "irrevelant" and the teachers dull and insensitive. Some feel they are isolated from the school's social life and feel they are still in high school.

The Private Colleges

The private colleges and universities were extremely cooperative and helpful in describing their special "opportunity" programs. None of them are eligible for direct Federal or State funds for the program, but most of them have made some commitment for dealing with "economically or culturally disadvantaged students." Financial support is drawn from tuition fees, private donations, faculty support, scholarships (State and private), and community support.

There are approximately 100,000 students attending private colleges and universities in California. These students come from all over the country with the greatest concentration from California. Private colleges enrolled 22,614 freshmen in Fall 1969. Most private colleges have moved to enroll minority students, offering a broad range of public and private scholarship support.

Twenty-six private colleges returned the survey questionnaire. These are the major private institutions of higher education in the State, enrolling 30,000 students.

The ethnic population reported by the private colleges was as follows. (The table reflects data from 22 schools; not all schools supplied complete ethnic enrollment data):

	Number	Percentage
Black	1,177	5.0%
Chicano	751	3.2%
Native American	93	.9%
Asian	641	2.7%
White	20,559	87.8%
Other	197	.4%
Total	23,418	100.0%

How many of the minority students are also in a "special opportunity classification" was not possible to determine from our data, although it might be assumed that many are.

Among the private colleges replying to our survey, 60% have some type of ethnic studies; while 13% reported that they offered a degree in ethnic studies.

A description of one private college "EOP" type program follows: The EOP program is under the direction of an Acting Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and their emphasis is to attract highly motivated and "talented" students. The sum of $75,000 is drawn from general student body funds, of which $1,000 is allocated to each EOP student. This sum is often supplemented through loans and other financial aids so that the student may receive extra assistance of up to $3,000 per year. The definition of an eligible student is that of family income under $6,000. The majority of the enrolled students are Black.

The attrition or "dropout" rates were as follows: 4 of the 16(25%) in the first admitted spring class, and 3 of the 28(14%) admitted the fall did not complete their work. There was also the general comment that women candidates did better than males. Grade-point figures were unavailable but the general impression was that of satisfactory performance.

There is available an ethnic studies program and certain courses which allow faculty, students and EOP'ers to evaluate and discuss their experiences. There are counseling and tutoring services; however, few students use these resources until they are in deep academic trouble. It is important to note that none of these services are staffed by Blacks, and this may be one of the reasons why counseling remains unused, except as an emergency measure. The university is anticipating a Ford Foundation Grant and the EOG program for additional financial assistance.

There are other emphasis which reflect the purposes of various private institutions. Some emphasize the importance of work as an inherent part of helping the "disadvantaged"; several have used a faculty "overload" in order to handle the extra admissions from EOP students, and all agreed that the special emphasis on including heretofore neglected minorities as a part of their campus was a healthy development. Most of them also felt that these programs would remain proportionately small, and some announced with pride that they were helping minority students long before the public sector.

Perhaps the most appropriate comment regarding the role of EOP in the private system came from one of their coordinators. When asked if EOP admissions would be costly, both financially and politically, since they would be "free", that their fee would then have to be taken out of other funds, and that they would replace a paying student, and perhaps alienate some alumni, the response was, "Surely, that's a risk and there is a financial loss. However, it's a matter of assigning priorities and we feel that working with minority groups is of the highest importance. It's worked very well, and when we bring the matter to our alumni groups, they often become the most enthusiastic and helpful in funding and helping to interpret the program."

CHAPTER IV

EVALUATION OF EOP

There are many facets to an evaluation of a program such as EOP. One can look for "normal" measures of success such as grade achievement and re-enrollment; one can emphasize certain breakthroughs in curriculum or the changing ethnic composition of California higher education; or one can focus on the program's integration in the overall institutional structure. All of these variables are relevant to EOP. In this chapter we will first discuss measures of success in relation to the four barriers presented in Chapter 1. Then, several "model" EOP programs will be presented.

EOP in Relation to the Institutional Structure

EOP at all institutions is a "jerry-built", largely unstructured program with little consistency, few standards and great flexibility. The EOP Director plays the role of ombudsman and trouble-shooter for minority students. He is relatively new on his job, is engaged in a number of institutional and ideological struggles and is often without power or resources. Nevertheless, he is a pioneer and something of a folk hero to many desk-bound bureaucrats. He has often managed to exert power by the force of his personality and under the banner of the cause which he represents. Because he is in an unstructured position, he can often get new things done or get old techniques re-routed. He belongs to his students and "relates" to them, often speaking for them to the larger institutions. If the program is very new (as in community colleges), the staff member may be white and may be on his way out, as was the pattern at other levels. That is, as more minority students enroll, the likelihood is that they will force a change in the director so that the EOP Director will be selected from one of the minorities.

These ethnic identity struggles are reflected not only in white, non-white staff changes but have also developed into Black-Chicano struggles on many campuses. Several campuses have resolved the problem by having one black and one Chicano as co-directors.

Most of the directors have the minimum of a college degree and some are working towards advanced degrees. The position of the director is an extremely difficult and sensitive one, partly because of his place in the institutional structure, partly because of his role as a representative of an ethnic minority, and partly because of the newness of the programs so that clear expectations and common purposes are still in the process of development.

Clearly, there are places in the University and State College structure for traditional departments. Departments give courses; they can aware degrees, they are represented on all levels of the campus hierarchy; they can plan beyond a year-to-year budget and they can hire professors who already have had training in a particular discipline. The department is integrated into the institution (vertical) and is also connected with a discipline and field that cuts across institutional lines (horizontal). For example, a chemist can see himself as a member of a department, and also as a chemist with ties to chemists throughout the world, and his Ph.D. signifies his training.

The EOP director has few of these ties. His training might have been in history, or social welfare, or as a public school teacher. His present position provides him with neither departmental nor professional - ties. He is neither an integral part of the professorial nor academic senate bodies. His role in the structure is primarily administrative, for which he may have had little training or experience. And he has little formal training and knowledge about the development of programs in other institutions, either, because they are so new, or because of lack of contact, except on an informal basis. However, his very newness brings a fresh perspective, based on his own experiences as a member of a minority. All of the directors have played pioneering roles in the development of EOP programs, and predictably, there are variations in programs from college to college and university to university.

The EOP director has some advantages in remaining independent of the traditional university structure. He is often in direct communication with the chancellor or president and does not have to wade through various committees for a direct hearing. Formal degree requirements (i.e. Ph.D) do not have to be met for hiring, and there is a refreshing interaction among EOP staff and their students, not often duplicated in regular departments.

But the price of remaining relatively independent may be high. Since he does not generally possess the formal academic requirements and does not hold an academic appointment, the director and his staff have little contact with other departments and have little power in the university system. The director is theoretically replaceable at any time and his general isolation often fosters an unrealistic view of what actually goes on in higher education. For example, EOP staff interviewed consistently overperceived the power of the chancellor, especially in the area of finances and of the status of tenured positions. Conversely, most underestimated the complexity of decision making in the institutions.

However, if EOP is to attract and retain able personnel, there must be some means of encouraging people to remain; to advance and to share their experiences. The relative autonomy that comes from isolation can be an enervating and creative experience, but it can also lead to a narrow myopia.

All of the EOP directors were concerned about their "powerless positions." Most felt hamstrung about budgetary problems and felt that the major questions (e.g. continuance or discontinuance of EOP, the amount of money, etc.) affecting their lives and their programs were decided elsewhere. The tenuous nature of the director's position is reflected in their length of employment--the EOP Directors have been in the position between 1 and 2 years. One of the most consistent changes has been the shift from white to ethnic personnel.

Success: Financial

One of the primary purposes of EOP was to provide financial assistance to enable low-income students to attend college. Therefore, the basic evaluative question relates to the adequacy of financial aid.

The general answer is "not adequate enough." Our interviews showed that financial aid is the student's greatest need. All students felt that they needed additional financial help and the present financial aid programs were complicated, inadequate and unreliable. Some programs of financial aid covered as many as seven different sources for one student: grants, scholarships, loans, work-study, etc. Part of the problem related to fixed expenses such as dormitory fees which used up a disproportionate percentage of the EOP grant. Part was due to personal budgeting problems, but the major issue remained -- there was not enough money. Students constantly borrowed from other sources including the EOP Director. There were continuous financial emergencies and some students were placed in the position of literally begging for jobs.

One of the most useful ways of handling financial difficulties was through employment. Here the work-study programs were valuable, although even these funds were limited. Students interviewed posed the question, "Which is more important, for me to study fulltime or hustle outside jobs in order to make ends meet ?"

Therefore, the program has not been fully successful in financing the student in such a way that monetary problems did not interfere with his academic success. The average student grant per year of $1504 at the University and $610 at the State colleges tells the story. The amounts are difficult to defend even under the broadest definitions of "adequacy."

EOP has been successful in attracting low-income minority students to college. Most of our students responded that without the financial benefits promised under EOP, they would not have considered attending an institution of higher learning.

Success: Geographical Barriers

By geography, we refer to items such as transportation and housing. Our student interviews show that both of these remain as major, unsolved problems.

The problems in Los Angeles are intimately related to the resources of that area. Both California State at Los Angeles and UCLA are virtually inaccessible by public transportation. The State College, although close to East Los Angeles, is cut off from the minority community by a major freeway and remains isolated except by private auto. The situation in the East Bay Area (Berkeley-Oakland) and the San Fernando Valley is not much better. The transportation problem is compounded if the EOP'er is working off-campus. The only workable solution appears to be through access to a private automobile. However, already strained student budgets have difficulty absorbing this extra cost.

Housing remains as another unsolved problem. There is a mixed student reaction to provisions for on-campus housing, and the search for reasonable off-campus facilities is a difficult and frustrating experience.

But it would be difficult to divorce the EOP problems of housing and transportation from those of the entire student population. There is little consensus on most of these issues -- some like the dormitories, others do not. Living at home may be good for some and detrimental for others. Small group living in a "fraternity" sense may be a better answer than large dorms or individual apartments.

Perhaps the most appropriate generalization in regard to transportation and housing is that they remain as problems, not only for the EOP'er but for the general student population. EOP students suffer most because of their severe financial deficit and individualized approach may be the only feasible solution.

Success: Motivational

By motivation we refer to variables such as a student's persistence, his pride and ability to complete his studies in spite of existing barriers. Wanting to go to college, study, achieve, and graduate have been considered explanations for the success of the middle-class student in higher education.

One evaluative measure of EOP is the proportion of students making progress towards a degree in contrast to the percentage of those who "drop out." Both variables are a reflection of the degree of student motivation, but they are imprecise at best. They lump together under one category a variety of causes for student dropout -- personal, financial, situational or academic. The leave may be only temporary, yet this factor is ignored in gross re-enrollment rates. In addition, data on re-enrollment is often fragmentary; therefore, the figures in this section should be viewed as illustrative rather than definitive.

The University figures for EOP are as follows: nearly 89% of their EOP freshmen admitted in 1967-68 returned in the fall of 1968, while 91% of their transfer students also re-enrolled. Similar rates were achieved by the following year's class. Percentage re-enrollment was somewhat lower for the state colleges where an estimated two-thirds to four-fifths re-enrolled. These figures remain as gross estimates and the most appropriate generalization is that the re-enrollment rates among EOP students are similar to those of the total student population.

The re-enrollment rates strongly indicate that the barrier of motivation is being successfully challenged under EOP. Part of the reason may be due to the development of ethnic pride, ethnic awareness and the development of a positive self-identity. EOP students are often motivated by and concerned about the state of their own minority communities. Many plan careers in human services, i.e., teaching, counseling, social service, political work, which will help them become leaders in the minority community.

Part of the reason may be due to EOP support, especially during the first year, when students are not counseled "out" at the first sign of academic problems but are given help instead. Peer groups also play an important role in providing the EOP'er with group supports for his sense of identity and in maintaining his personal goals in alignment with those of his particular minority community.

Success: Academic

The most commonly used measure of success is the gradepoint average. Even these figures may be misleading since it is difficult to control for factors such as the number and kinds of courses taken; nevertheless, it does provide another means for evaluating EOP'ers.

For the University, the EOP'ers success is comparable to that of the general student body. Generally, the regularly admitted University freshman (2.67) does slightly better than the regularly admitted EOP student (2.47), who in turn does better than the special action EOP student (2.00). Special action EOP transfer students (2.27) are similar to regular EOP transfer students (2.47). Therefore, from the University experience, the EOP student is achieving success in spite of his "disadvantaged" background.

TABLE I

University of California
Educational Opportunity Program Students
By Admissions Classification and Median Grade Point Average[2]

Admissions Classification	1966-67		1967-68		(Fall) 1968-69	
	Number	GPA	Number	GPA	Number	GPA
Academically Eligible Freshmen	166	2.41	306	2.30	280	2.47
Academically Eligible Transfers	48	2.66	106	2.48	105	2.47
Special Action Freshmen	75	2.05	143	2.04	306	2.00
Special Action Transfers	65	2.20	139	2.32	199	2.27
Continuing Eligible Students	106	2.40	298	2.43	665	2.52
Continuing Special Action	12	1.73	98	2.27	390	2.15
TOTALS	472		1,090		1,945[1]	

---

[1] Total of 1945 does not include:
42 Santa Cruz students (pass/fail grades only)
51 students who withdrew
2038

[2] Median Grade Point Average, All Regular Freshmen Admittees

	No.*	GPA
1967-68	12,365	2.59
1968-69	11,142	2.67

*These data include only students who completed the fall quarter.

Source: Statement prepared by the University for the Joint Interim Hearing of the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittees on Education and Capital Outlay. San Francisco, California December 3, 1969.

A similar generalization can be made for the State Colleges. Although State college grade point achievement is not strictly comparable to the University figures because of a variation in reporting procedures (i.e., they are in range categories such as 1.5 to 1.9), the evidence indicates that EOP students' performance is not that different from regularly enrolled students.

For example, for those State college EOP students who were not "educationally qualified, 62% earned a C or better. Thus, most EOP students were able to maintain grades, even those without adequate prior educational standing. It should also be noted that grade point achievement rises as the student continues in school. While it is true that for those students who were "special admission", after one year 38% earned less than a C, it must be seen that for the other 62% the EOP opportunity was more than justified. For these students, even if only one out of two were able to maintain an adequate college performance level, the trial would be well worth it, for these are students who, if evaluated by regular admission criteria, would never have been admitted.

Therefore, using the two standard means for evaluating success - re-enrollment and grade point -- the EOPer is doing very well. He does not look that different from the general student population.

There are several hypothesized explanations for the success of the EOP student when using these traditional measures. Each of these is worth noting since they imply courses for future action:

1. That the admissions standards of the institutions may be open to question. The use of high school achievement, standardized college entrance examinations and the like may have to be re-examined, especially when dealing with culturally different populations.

2. That the supportive services -- financial, tutorial, peer group support, and the individualized attention that the EOP student receives -- are extremely important in helping the EOPer to achieve success. Tutoring and counseling programs begin with formal contacts but seem rapidly to move into informal or group tutoring and mutual help, often along ethnic lines. More adequate services and direct support of self help peer groups might lead to even better performance.

3. That the recruitment and admissions processes of EOP are highly selective so that only those "disadvantaged" students who are most likely to succeed end up in the program. Our survey showed that competition rather than cooperation existed among the segments of higher education in the recruitment of bright minority students and staff. Therefore, the programs are made up of the most highly motivated and the most academically capable students.

Other Methods of Evaluation

Our study emphasizes the diversity among EOP programs. Therefore, measures of success, aside from the traditional ones such as grade point average, are dependent upon how individual program goals are stated and how priorities are put into operation. These variations in themselves are neither necessarily positive nor negative, and as one administrator told us, "Even in a traditional field such as physics, there are almost completely different programs from college to college. The basic question is whether they're doing quality work."

In the following section we have developed two different models of EOP programs based on our discussion with EOP directors, staff, other faculty, students and administrators. These models are, to use a sociological term, "ideal models" in that they are abstractions, so that none of the programs fits the model perfectly, but there is enough evidence to warrant the inclusion of programs into these types.

Model I: EOP as a program towards acculturation and upmobility.

This model is the clearest and most often advocated by EOP directors. It has strong historical validity--other groups, especially of immigrant backgrounds, were able to use the educational institutions as one way of breaking out of the ghetto. Sub-goals might include terms such as integration, breaking into the establishment, or learning the ropes. Programs with this emphasis would place a high priority on regular academic skills as well as an ability to work closely with the host institution. The following college, which we label A, closely approximates this model.

College A is a relatively new institution, located in a primarily white, middle-class setting. Interestingly enough, this location may be partially responsible for the acceptance of the EOP program--the surrounding racially conservative and insulated community does not seem as threatened by the influx of a small, non-white student population, as perhaps an institution closer to the ghetto.

The program emphasizes academic learning as a top priority, and the staff feels that the term "new educational horizons" is a much more appropriate term than EOP. Several students were seen wearing a badge that said, "Universality is my bag." And the staff is an integrated one, including Blacks, Chicanos and whites. A Caucasian girl, for example, is in charge of community relations, a Chicano co-director in charge of counseling and the director is Black.

The goal for students is acculturation and getting a college diploma, with the eventual hope that all races could live together. The program has community support--voluntary services from professionals such as psychiatrist, and an optometrist; legal services, and community financial contributions. Recruitment has included a group of "high potential" students (students active in the ghetto communities but with low academic qualifications) as well as the usual emphasis on the academically qualified.

The "EOP package" is available--job opportunities are also obtainable at a nearby resort attraction. Students are taken to speaking engagements by the director so that there is visible exposure between the student and various community groups. The program is a congruent "fit" among the director, his personality, the community and the administration and faculty of the college. The program has high acceptance among faculty and administrators.

The role of the director is a multiple one and includes actions that range from curriculum building to cash loans to students. Much time is spent in working with the surrounding community (primarily white), and students are intimately connected with each operation. Most EOP students live away from the campus but no special arrangements are made for housing or transportation.

There is pride in the program which is shared by all members. The entire staff was available for interviews, and group discussions were arranged. EOP is conceived as a transitory device to help the student enter and begin a college career, then to move to the status of a regular student.

Most programs follow the basic parameters of Model I. There is a strong emphasis on academic performance and one director tells his students, "You are the intellectual elite of the minority community--you're getting your chance to prove it, so make the most of it." The basic message is "shape up or ship out" and often, an ethnic director is more able to emphasize this message than a white one. For example, one Black director who had just moved into his position felt that the previous director (white) was much too permissive in his dealings with his EOP students and let them get away with excuses and rationalizations, rather than pushing them to work hard and to achieve at a high level.

The overall success of College A is difficult to quantify at this moment in time. The students are performing well and they will no doubt function adequately after college.

Model II: Acculturation with an emphasis on ethnic identity.

This type of program also emphasizes acculturation but the focus is not primarily on assimilation or integration. The development of a strong ethnic identity, learning of one's own ethnic heritage and a concern with the barrio or ghetto are major priorities under this model.

A major research finding showed an informal relationship between EOP, Ethnics Studies Sections and minority student groups, each giving psychological and/or material support to each other. There is a need for continued socialization between various ethnic and minority groups so that cultural pluralism rather than racial segregation can emerge. The program at College B is illustrative of Model II.

College B emphasizes the importance of an ethnic identity, so that one of the primary purposes of obtaining a college education is to go back and work in the "ghetto." Part of this process includes coming to terms with one's own ethnicity, therefore, there is a very close relationship between EOP and ethnic studies. For example, all entering EOP'ers take the introductory course in ethnic studies and many repeat this course. Advice, study tips and other ways of "learning the system" are often covered in these courses and they may be a substitute for mandatory counseling.

The staff is non-white; the director is Black, and there is a Chicano and an Asian assistant. There is a desire to remain somewhat separate from the ongoing college; the staff is housed in a relatively obscure barracks area, in contrast to most other EOP programs, which are close to the administrative headquarters. The obscurity of the location and of the program from the mainstream may be deduced from the reactions of the campus police--when asked for the location of EOP, they did not know, and they were the most surprised when they discovered that the EOP offices were very close by.

Overtly, EOP has a great deal of autonomy--courses, staffing and the running of the program appear to be primarily in the hands of the staff. But there is very little financial autonomy, as the director said, "Some vice-president even has to sign my requisition for toilet paper." The separateness of the administration and the EOP staff is apparently a mutually agreed upon strategy that is satisfactory for both.

The success of Model II is again difficult to evaluate in quantitative terms. But placed within the context of the goals of the program, it is functioning well. As in our generalization concerning Model I, this program is a congruence of the director, his personality and his purposes within the environment of the college and the community. Morale is good, the students are re-enrolling and achieving at a successful rate.

Our evidence indicates that both types of programs are successful in relation to their respective goals. Critics may disagree on the specified priorities, but it should be noted that the students under both models are fulfilling academic requirements and receiving an education leading towards a degree.

There are other means that are being used to evaluate the success of EOP. These are not strictly the "goals" of the program but mention was made of them often enough so that they are included in the report.

EOP and its relation to social control

The relationship between EOP and social control was never brought up directly. Nevertheless, the kinds of questions that were often asked (e.g., "Is it the EOP kids who are raising hell on the campus?") and the kinds of answers (e.g. "No, my EOP kids were not involved in that incident.") revealed that fulfilling the function of social control was another measure of the success of EOP.

Strong sentiment for this position came from administrators and non-EOP students who repeatedly commented on the relationship between EOP students and campus unrest. One administrator observed that the main impetus for campus distruption came from upper middle-class white radicals, both students and professors, and not from EOP students. Another felt that EOP students were not the major cause of unrest but that these students were often the target of campus radicals.

There is a general tendency at most institutions to equate minority groups and EOP. This is especially true at "white" colleges so that rightly or wrongly when non-whites are involved in any visible activity, their actions are often attributed to EOP students.

The pressure of these perceptions is not lost on the EOP director and staff. Most agreed that one criterion used in their evaluation was their ability to control their students. Many voluntarily reiterated the statement made by the campus administrator--that the main problem of social control came from white radicals, and not the EOP contingent. Some were able to negotiate temporary administrative support for their programs on the basis of the social control issue.

Using the criterion of social control, the EOP program has been successful in introducing new populations into the educational institutions with a minimal amount of disruption. Aside from several past isolated incidents (e.g. San Fernando Valley State), the EOP student has not been heavily involved in disruptive campus activities: he is generally too busy working towards his college degree.

EOP as a means towards social change

There was consensus among our sample that EOP serves as an instrument for social change. Some thought in global terms--that EOP could provide the leadership to bring about changes in the total society, while others were more modest in scope and thought that EOP could modify the educational establishment. Still others were content to limit the impact to their respective college or university.

It is impossible to measure and evaluate the effect of EOP on the total society at this (or perhaps any other) time. Those directors who mentioned the ambitious goal referred to the training of individuals who might eventually make their impact on society, as well as EOP's influence on curriculum (e.g., Ethnic Studies) that would eventually be felt in the larger world.

EOP has already made some impact on attitudes in the educational institutions where it has been developed. All directors felt that their programs and the relative success of their students were doing much to break the old stereotype that non-whites, especially the Black and the Chicano, are unable to use the four-year institutions as a vehicle for upward mobility. The whole area of admissions can be viewed differently because of the "success" of EOP students. Fears that the standards of higher education might suffer with the entrance of black and brown faces have not been justified.

Directors also feel that EOP will slow down the drift towards an "intellectual elitism," and instead re-emphasize a more democratic model of education. The change of admissions standards and the inclusion of people with different cultural backgrounds provides for a broader representation in higher education. However, most of the EOP programs at the four year institutions at this time screen for the "elite" among the disadvantaged, so that large numbers of ghetto youth remain unserved.

The most dramatic impact of EOP has been on individual institutions. Color has appeared on some campuses for the first time and corresponding changes have occurred in the curriculum.[5] The most measurable changes have taken place in ethnic studies as courses that were never offered several years ago have now become a part of the curriculum.

Faculty members have also experienced changes in attitudes. They repeatedly told us that the entrance of non-whites to previously all white middle-class institutions was a dramatic move, and that many professors (labelled both conservative and liberal) were forced to rethink their positions; to modify stereotypes and to address themselves to the problems of minorities in American society. The majority of the faculty we talked to in the course of the study felt that these changes were beneficial, but our contacts with other professors outside of the study suggests this view is not unanimous. Some still equate minority groups with the lowering of standards and a lessening of the quality of education.

The most important group to have felt the impact of EOP has been the Black and Chicano communities, who for the first time are thinking in terms of higher education for themselves and their children. The process may be slow and the expectations naive, but now there are bodies representing minority students in actual attendance at colleges and universities all over the State. There is hope that the old cycle of poverty, lack of education and unemployment can be broken. There are already indications that there has been a positive effect on the motivation and performance of minority elementary and high school students.

Other evaluative comments concerning EOP were scattered and difficult to categorize. For example, several comments dealt with the choice of a major as a sign of a good EOP program (i.e., a preference for the physical sciences over the social sciences). Others felt that a successful program could best be measured by a cost per student analysis. We feel that these measures are incidental to the main goals of introducing heretofore neglected minority and low-income students to higher education.

In summary, we find that EOP students are successful, as the vast majority make satisfactory progress towards their college degree. This, in spite of the limited success of EOP in overcoming some of the major barriers such as finances, housing and transportation. Further, EOP has been instrumental in introducing minority faculty on the campus, has effected changes in the curriculum and has also made an impact on the surrounding college communities. It is not difficult to support the generalization that EOP has been an extremely effective educational experiment.

---

[5] Forces other than EOP have also effected this change. But EOP has been a prime mover in this direction.

Appendix

NAME OF INSTITUTION

COMMUNITY COLLEGE QUESTIONNAIRE

Notes: Please keep in mind the several types of "disadvantaged" students which have been defined for use in this questionnaire.

Please attach a copy of the Civil Rights Compliance form submitted to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for 1968-69 for your college.

---

1. What special efforts is your college making to recruit, counsel, tutor, remediate, and/or provide other types of educational opportunity for students from minority ethnic groups or low-income families? (Attach descriptive material, if available)

a. Do you consider these efforts to be equivalent to the EOP in State Colleges and the University? (Please explain)

2. What special staff has been employed for the program efforts described above? (Give position title, title of person to whom the staff member reports, and minority group of the special staff members)

Position Title	Title to Whom Staff Member Reports	Minority Background	Additional Comments

3. Please estimate how many minority group students are presently enrolled at your college (if current figures are not available, please use those which you reported to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for 1968), indicating date and source of information.

	All Student Population Fall 1969	Estimated Ethnic Composition of Local Community by %
Black		
Mexican-American (Sp. surname)		
Oriental		
Caucasian		
Native American (Indian)		
Other, please specify:		
TOTAL		

4. Please estimate how many minority group students are presently receiving aid under each of the following programs and the expected average amount given to each (if current figures are not available, please use 1968 data), indicating date and source of information.

Program	Number of Recipients	Average Amount
Federal work-study		
Federal EO grant		
National Defense Student Loan		
Local work-study		
Local scholarship-grant		
Local (college loan)		
Federally Insured Loan		
Private scholarship-grant		
Private non-bank loan		
Other: ______		
______		

Note: Please indicate any programs in which the college does not participate at all and plans, if any, for initiating same.

______

______

______

______

5. What special programs and services do you offer to students from ethnic minority groups which are different from or in addition to those offered to your regular students?

Program or Service	Status: Not Special	Status: Different	Status: Additional	Number Served	Budget Allocation
Pre-admissions assistance					
Registration process					
Program advising					
Personal counseling					
Tutoring					
Financial aid advising					
Employment counseling					
Assistance in obtaining housing					
Other, specify:					

6. Does your college offer a special basic studies, developmental, or remedial program for minority group students who are not ready for college-level work? YES___ NO___ Does the college offer this type of program for all students, regardless of background? YES___ NO___ Please describe briefly whatever program(s) you offer, including the name by which the program is known and breakdown by number of minority and non-minority students served.

Program Name	Program Activities	Minority Students Served	Non-Minority Students Served

7. Does your college offer one or more Ethnic Studies programs? YES___ NO___ If not, is the college planning to offer one in the near future? YES___ NO___ Please describe briefly what you offer (or plan to offer).

___

___

___

___

___

8. Does your college sponsor any special tutorial projects in the following categories? Please describe briefly.

Off-campus ____

Volunteer ____

High School ____

Jr. High School ____

Elementary School ____

Other ____

9. Do you collaborate with the State Colleges or the University of California in any special programs for minority group students? YES___ NO___
If yes, please describe. (Include your role as sponsor or cooperator, the institutions with whom you are cooperating, number of students involved, etc.)

10. Please estimate the following percentages to the best of your ability:

	All Students	Minority Group Students
Dropout during first year		
Transfer to four-year college		
Dropout after second year		

11. What plans does your college have for doing a better job of meeting the needs of minority group or otherwise disadvantaged students?

12. What do you believe to be the strengths and weaknesses of your present efforts to provide such opportunity?

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

13. What do you believe to be the strengths and weaknesses of the present statewide educational opportunity program?

14. The Joint Committee on Higher Education of the California legislature has raised the following four questions which provide the focus for this study. Please comment on each.

(A) How should the educational opportunity programs of each segment of the California higher educational system relate in view of the special mission of each segment?

(B) What, if anything, should govern the direction of students to a particular segment of the California higher education system?

(C) What is the potential of jointly conducted educational opportunity programs in which the university and/or perhaps state colleges, administers the counseling and tutorial aspect at the community college?

(D) What programs are essential to maximize the efficiency of the educational opportunity program, and also, which programs and service components are desirable but are not essential?

15. What would you like to suggest to the legislature regarding the statewide educational opportunities program on higher education? For the special program at this institution?

16. If the majority of educational opportunity funds were to be redirected to the community colleges, what do you feel would be the overall effect at this institution?

17. What, in your opinion, would be the implications (both positive and negative) of channeling educationally disadvantaged youth to the community colleges?

CONFIDENTIAL

UC AND STATE COLLEGE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you have at this institution a distinct Educational Opportunity Program(EOP)? (If not distinctly identifiable, please explain status and activities of similar program(s).)
   Comments:

2. Define the components of the EOP program offered at this institution by completing items below. (Give your best estimates, if actual figures are not available.)

EOP Components	No. of Students	Amount of Funds Allotted	
		1968 Budget	Fall '69 Budget
Special Action Admission			
Assistance with Admission Process			
Pre-registration Advising			
Curriculum Counseling			
Personal Counseling			
Tutoring			
Assistance in Securing Housing			
Assistance in Securing Financial Aid			

3. Can you estimate how many EOP students in 1968/69 received:

	No. of Students	Amount of Funds Allotted	
		1968 Budget	Fall '69 Budget
Federal Work Study Funds			
Federal Educational Opportunity Grants			
NDSL Program Funds			
FISL (Federally Insured Student Loans)			
Private Loans			
Institutionally Controlled Scholarships and Grants			
Tuition Waivers			
Special Funds for Books & Supplies			
Other, please specify:			

4. How does this institution define the Educational Opportunities Program?

5. How does this institution define an Educational Opportunities Program student?

6. For the Fall 1969, please estimate for new admittances:

	Number
Total EOP applications before screening	
Total applications accepted for consideration	
Total EOP candidates admitted under Special EOP Category	
Total EOP candidates admitted under Regular Admission Standards	
Total academically eligible candidates not accepted through EOP	

Comments:

7. Describe the current (Fall 1969) EOP professional staff (non-students):

Title of Position	Regular Academic		Salary	Ethnic Background	Educ. Degree & Major	Time in Position	Major Program Function
	Yes	No					

8. Do you use paid part-time student help? If so, how many and in what capacities?

9. Do you use student, faculty or other volunteers? If so, how many and in what capacities?

10. Please estimate the full-time student population now enrolled at this institution.

	Total Number	Number Considered EOP Students
Black		
Chicano Mexican-American (Sp. surname)		
NativeAmerican (Indian)		
Asian		
Caucasian		
Other, specify:		

TOTAL

11. Of the current EOP population, please estimate:

_____ Number of beginning freshmen

_____ Number of transfers from junior colleges

_____ Number of continuing students enrolled in the EOP at this institution from from the previous academic year

_____ Number of students from out-of-State

_____ Other

_____ TOTAL

12. How many of your current EOP students are service veterans? __________

13. Does this institution offer a degree program in Ethnic Studies? Yes____ No____

If not, does this institution offer any courses in Ethnic Studies?Yes____ No____

14. What, if any, if the relationship between EOP and the Ethnic Studies program at this institution?

Please comment:____

____

____

____

____

____

15. Please estimate the percentage of EOP students currently enrolled (Fall 1969) as Ethnic Studies majors________ .

16. Who is the EOP Director's direct supervisor within the institution's organizational structure? ______________________________

17. Where is the EOP headquarters located ?

_____ In central administration building

_____ In other institution building, specify: ______________________________

_____ Other____

18. What is the amount of the EOP budget for the fiscal year 1969/70 ? ___________
(Please attach a copy of your budget.)

19. Who decides how EOP funds are allocated? ___________________________________

____

20. What is the role of the EOP director in such budget decisions ? ______________

____

____

21. The Joint Committee on Higher Education of the California Legislature has raised the following four questions which provide the focus for this study. Please comment on each:

A) How should the educational opportunity programs of each segment of the California higher educational system relate in view of the special mission of each segment ?

____

____

____

____

B) What, if anything, should govern the direction of students to a particular segment of the California higher education system ?

____

____

____

____

22. What, in your opinion, are the strengths and weaknesses of the EOP at this institution? Of the present statewide EOP program? Please elaborate:

23. What would you like to suggest to the legislature regarding the statewide educational opportunities program on higher education? For the EOP at this institution?

24. If the majority of EOP funds were to be redirected to the community colleges, what do you feel would be the overall effect at this institution?

24a. What percent of currently enrolled EOP students would be forced to discontinue their education? ________

STUDENT INTERVIEW GUIDELINES

- Family Income (Approx.)

- No. brothers & sisters

1. Residence

2. High School

3. High School GPA (Did your high school prepare you for college?)
   High School major studies

4. Recruitment
   a. How did you decide to come to college?
   b. How did you decide to come to this college?
   c. How did you get into the EOP Program?
   d. What was your economic situation at time of recruitment?
   e. What promises were made regarding: (1) financial aid?
      (Who promised?) (2) academic aid?

5. Financial Aid
   a. Was aid given in amount and type promised? Explain.
   b. How much financial aid are you receiving? What form (EOP, WS?)
   c. What financial burden, if any, is placed on your parents?

6. Academic Aid
   a. Major Study focus
   b. Was academic aid delivered as promised? Explain.
      (1) tutoring aid? hours/week
      (2) is it effective?

7. Personal Counseling
   a. What kind have you received?
   b. Is it effective?

8. Housing
   a. Was housing promised?
   b. Did you receive housing aid?
   c. Is aid geared to local conditions?
   d. Does it fill your housing need?
   e. What would be ideal housing aid? On Campus? Amount $?

9. Transportation
   a. Do you commute to school?
      (1) hours commuting daily
      (2) cost/month
      (3) public or private
   b. Amount EOP aid available
   c. Amount you need

10. Employment
    a. Did you receive work thru EOP?
    b. Were you promised work during recruitment?
    c. Are you working on an EOP job? Other job?
       (1) How much alloted/semester
       (2) Was it sufficient?
    d. How many hours/week do you work?